

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME VIII

New York, Saturday, August 12, 1916

Number 93

Contents

Editorial Notes.....	25
Leading Editorials	
Neutrality in Strikes.....	28
Tainted Ballots.....	30
Publicity for Income Returns.....	31
General Articles	
The Rôle of the Middle West..... Edgar E. Robinson	33
Amateur Diplomacy Abroad..... Robert Dell	35
Metchnikoff..... Walter B. Cannon	37
The Lot of the Inventor..... Alvin S. Johnson	39
Getting Divorced..... Alden Harden	42
Correspondence.....	43
Books and Things..... P. L.	45
Reviews of Books	
The New International..... H. B. A.	46
An Excellent Hate Story..... Alice Duer Miller	48
The Machinery of the State..... H. J. L.	48
Unindustrial Education..... Katharine Anthony	50

HOW much has the cause of woman suffrage gained by Mr. Hughes's declaration? Nobody knows, of course, but the gain must be substantial if we measure it by the sorrow, fear and anger of the anti-suffragists. Take their letters in one issue of one newspaper. "Without restating the many arguments against woman suffrage," says the first letter-writer, "it is certain that the increased emotionalism of a bi-sexual electorate would be sure to deteriorate its quality in a direction where its quality will least stand deterioration." The writer belongs to the male or notoriously unemotional sex. Another writer complains that Mr. Hughes "has given a perfect demonstration of how much courage he possesses by his complete capitulation to the Congressional Union, which is made up of a few hundred suffragists utterly unrepresentative of American womanhood." Here the doctrine seems to be that the smaller the group whose object a candidate approves the greater must be his cowardice. It does not make sense, but it does make copy. "Let us unite in shouting for woman suffrage," exclaims a third letter writer, if we want every congested community "entered" by "the

dire local conditions which abound in San Francisco." This does not throw any light on the main question, but it may interest railway managers. "The dire local" would not be a bad name for a suburban train.

UNTIL it actually occurred the European War was held to be impossible. No nation would plunge the world into such a disaster. In much the same manner we are talking as though the shutting-down of our railroads as a result of a strike or lockout were equally unthinkable. Even the announcement that the 400,000 trainmen have given their officers the right to call a strike, although anticipated, causes much anxious fear, and incites the *New York Times* to splutter about the "arrogance of unionism," and the wickedness of men "so selfish and class-conscious that they do not see or do not reck that they risk their citizenship for an increase of wages." The *Times* asserts that the trainmen were not justified "in taking the power to strike as a measure of negotiation." It believes that a general railroad strike is an "inconceivable supposition," and "if there were any such danger it would be necessary that it should be anticipated by an offensive defensive once for all, and the sooner the better." The *Times* wants no weakness, no trucking to labor, "no nonsense about the methods by which the unions should be made to appreciate that they have gone too far."

THE problem cannot be solved by putting the workmen up against a wall and shooting them, nor by any other of the "strong" methods usually advocated in such crises. Nor can the result of the issue between trainmen and railroads be left to a trial of strength. It would not be a real strike because each side would injure not the other but the public. While the trainmen could hold out for six months and the railroad companies for an equal period, the public could not hold out a fortnight. Almost immediately there would be a universal industrial stagnation, unemployment, immense distress, and actual starvation. No community pos-

sessing the power of self-defense would permit such a strike to continue, and in the crisis all rights, privileges and immunities, all laws and constitutions would give way to the nation's right of self-preservation. The conflict, therefore, must in last analysis be determined by the American people, through the federal government. Federal conciliation, and if that fails, arbitration of one sort or another is in the end inevitable. The workmen and companies may go through all the forms of bargaining and threatening and may even get to the point of striking for a day or two. But the companies know and the union leaders know that whatever the course of the controversy it must surely end in a voluntary agreement between the two parties or in some form of judicial decision by the public at large.

THE public intolerance of strikes and lockouts in railroad and public-service corporations brings the advent of government ownership perceptibly nearer. The old theory that the employer may pay what he will and the employees may quit their jobs if unsatisfied here breaks down. The employers may not lock out their men and the employees may not strike. The railroads are being gradually deprived of the initiative and freedom of decision which have always been supposed to inhere in business management. They have not the right to determine their own rates, to raise or even lower the price of transportation, or to determine what service they will give to the public, and under what conditions. The right to fix wages and conditions of labor, either of their own volition or by haggling with the employees, is also taken away. The result is that the railroads are approaching a position in which they have the burdens of management without any assurance of profit. As this process continues it is not improbable that railroad companies will be more than willing to surrender their shadow of authority and ask the nation to take over this essentially public industry. Whether such government ownership would be advantageous to the skilled workers is perhaps open to question, but it cannot for a moment be doubted that the unskilled workers, amounting to 70 or 80 per cent of all railroad employees, would be immensely benefited by the change.

AS an exhibit in the case of the United States against inefficiency, Mr. Hughes might consider the action of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge in voting against the confirmation of Mr. George Rublee for Federal Trade Commissioner. One of Senator Lodge's constituents recently had some letters published in the *Springfield Republican* which reveal important causes of governmental inefficiency in general and of Senator Lodge's in par-

ticular. Here are the reasons given by the Senator for his anti-Rublee vote: 1. "Just before his appointment Mr. Rublee took an active part in supporting the Democratic ticket." This is untrue. Mr. Rublee was on the executive committee of the Progressive party, gave money to the Progressives, was regarded as leader of the New Hampshire Progressives. He voted for all the Progressive candidates except one: for senator he voted for a Democrat who had had Progressive endorsement at the previous election. 2. "Many senators opposed him because of his work on behalf of the Stevens bill." This is both untrue and silly—untrue because Mr. Rublee has never worked for the Stevens bill; silly because he had a perfect right to if he wished. 3. ". . . great objection to him on account of his activities in securing the passage of the bill under which he received his appointment." This is true and silly. Mr. Rublee was the chief workman in the creation of the Federal Trade Commission—an overwhelming reason for his appointment. 4. "Senatorial courtesy" . . . and the allegation that "Mr. Rublee was not a bonafide resident of New Hampshire." This is untrue and silly—untrue because Cornish, N. H., has been Mr. Rublee's home for years; silly because it is not written in the law that a Federal Trade Commissioner must live in New Hampshire. Such are the reasons put forth by the Republican senator generally acclaimed by Republicans the best intellect in the Senate. Mr. Hughes, if elected, has difficulties ahead.

WE are having boom times to-day, and almost anyone can find a job. But in 1917, or 1918 or 1920 or 1925, sooner or later, we shall have again one of our recurring industrial depressions, with soup kitchens, and wood yards and inevitable unemployment commissions, which will investigate and gravely report that the time to prevent unemployment is years before the unemployment comes. Then all will be forgotten and nothing will be done. In the handling of this problem we are not unlike the indolent negro who would not mend his leaky roof so long as it rained and would not mend it in dry weather because to do so was no longer necessary. Each unemployment commission advises that public expenditures be stabilized. Roads, canals, and other public improvements should be constructed in bad times when there is little demand for labor instead of in good times when there is plenty of employment. But it is exactly in hard times that money for public improvements is almost impossible to obtain. It is to-day when employment is steady that our governments and corporations should set aside sums of money to be expended—not immediately, when wages are high and materials expensive, but upon the first

approach of an industrial crisis. Such a proposal is worked out in some detail by Mr. William Hard in *Everybody's Magazine*, in a plan which provides that the federal government set aside an annual sum for irrigation, drainage and other improvements, but expend only a part of the sum each year, leaving the excess, say 10 per cent, to be used whenever the President shall decide. In the meanwhile all preparations are to be made, so that the working force can be immediately increased upon the first sign of an industrial depression.

THE trade war announced by the Allies had already found a dubious beginning in the British blacklist when Mr. Asquith announced the appointment of a tariff-reform committee. Both its objects and its composition cannot in any way dispel our fears. No one can object to the main entrance of industries essential to national security or to the development of imperial resources. But there is a sinister suggestion about the hint that steps must be taken "to secure new markets" which the blacklist will only confirm. Nor is it possible to be optimistic about the prevention of a foreign control over imperial sources of supply. If a serious attempt is to be made in this fashion to delimit the field of possible German investment we are only having the way prepared for a new Armageddon. It is difficult to believe that the committee nominated will appreciate this fact. Only two out of seventeen members are labor representatives. Mr. W. A. S. Hewins is a determined protagonist of fiscal war upon Germany. Sir A. Mond is a recent and enthusiastic convert to that policy. A majority of the committee is intellectually pledged to a revision of the British fiscal system, and the war has dimmed Lord Balfour of Burleigh's stout championship of free trade. Not less sinister is the fact that the liberal journals like the *Daily News* and the *Daily Chronicle* announce themselves as in that state of open mind which is the next step to complete conviction. It is evident that careful watch must be kept upon this systematic effort against the establishment of a stable peace.

ENGLISHMEN shake their heads over the impractical Irish, and wonder over hidden sources of misunderstanding. The reappointment of Lord Wimborne as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, however, suggests that there are sources of misunderstanding which are neither fantastic nor hidden. Lord Wimborne is an estimable sporting peer, quite capable of signing his surname as often as his nominal office requires, and a pleasant host at the Castle. But the majority of the Irish people simply do not see why a figurehead like the Lord Lieutenant should, in a country seriously impoverished, cost them a salary as large as that which is

paid to the President of the United States. If the Irish people had the same status as the Canadians, they might conceivably be glad to pay for an expensive ornamental governor-general. As it is, they resent being compelled to lay out over \$75,000 a year on a nonentity. When will the class from which the Wimbornes are recruited see the evil of this kind of exaction?

AFTER the war is over there will be many books on the natural history of atrocity. Perhaps the best will be written by a psychologist who can plot the atrocity curve and who knows enough facts to explain its major ups and downs. Certainly Mr. Asquith will not write the best book. He said the other day that "the recrudescence of deliberate and calculated barbarity on the part of Germany indicates her sense of desperation." If that is so, what was indicated by Germany's acts of deliberate and calculated barbarity in the earliest days of the war, and by the sudden decrease in this barbarity after the first six weeks? The meagre facts known at present do not support the theory that German atrocity rises when German self-confidence falls, or the opposite theory, or the theory that German atrocity is a constant. The known facts do not support any theory of atrocity. They do not explain the workings of the official German mind.

IS it fair to doubt the authenticity of spirit messages on the ground that the writers never seem to have learned anything valuable by their change from this world to the next? Would not the same test, applied to travellers who have left home for foreign lands, often result in a belief that they could hardly be in the place from which their messages were dated? Take the first case that comes to hand and apply the test. After being ten days in England Mr. S. S. McClure says, in an interview dated London: "This war is going to be a struggle to the bitter end, with the strongest forces victorious. The side that is gradually pounded down until it weakens is the one that is going to lose." You have read messages from the spirit world that need not fear comparison with this. Yet you would not on that account be disposed to deny that Mr. McClure was in England, or that he was willing to adopt this strange method of communicating with his friends in the United States.

GERMAN influence may safely be assumed to lie behind the activities of the Flemish party in its movement for a federal Belgium. Long before the outbreak of the present war, to be sure, there was some discontent among the Flemish-speaking provinces over the political preponderance of the French-speaking provinces under the existing constitution. There was a Flemish nationality

movement, fostered by a few intellectuals. We may be sure that during the occupation, Germany has done everything in her power to infuse real life into this movement. Belgium split in two, on the line of language, would become impotent internationally. One half of it would become the field of German intrigue and the other half, of French intrigue. The Flemish nationalists support their aspirations by the analogy of federated states like Austria-Hungary and Switzerland. But it is inconceivable that men with enlightened political views should regard Austria-Hungary as a model, instead of a warning. As for Switzerland, her position differs from Belgium in that she is not the world's battle field. Italy, France and Germany have no ground for interfering in the politics of Switzerland. Germany and France would have every reason for political interference in a disunited Belgian state. The Allies, therefore, can never consent to the federalization of Belgium.

Neutrality in Strikes

WITHOUT its street railroads New York would be an island desert. They are the means not merely of business, but also of social existence. They make possible that swift and effective transportation which alone ensures the growth of so vast a community. Over their two hundred and fifty miles of track a population almost equivalent to the total population of the United States is annually carried. The employees in themselves would constitute a fair-sized town in the Middle West. In that aspect it has become simply inevitable that the company should at all costs maintain and operate its roads. That duty in actual law transcends what service it may owe to its stockholders and it is the business of public authority to see to it that the duty is fully performed. In the event of difficulty with its workers its relation to the public clearly places the street railroad in a special position. It passes along streets and highways. It comes by its very nature in contact with the most intimate parts of social life. The cessation of its activities throws an intolerable burden upon the public.

The victory of the workers in the street railway strike of New York is the least important element in a novel and suggestive situation. The strike took its origin in the natural tendency of labor to organize for its self-protection. That the men had serious grievances which called for redress—inadequate wages, long hours of work, unhealthy conditions, antiquated methods of discipline—all these were important only insofar as they fed the natural appetite for association. They

explain the rapidity with which the principles of trade unionism were embraced; they do more than illustrate the causes of its use.

Unionism in the street-railway industry has for nine years waited its opportunity. Practically every great city except Philadelphia—itsself in the throes of a similar contest—had accepted the right of organization. But the immense financial interests behind the companies had prevented any consistent or effective consolidation of labor effort. The change came because the intense dissatisfaction with conditions had provided the cohesive cement of group-action. The men had exhausted the possibilities of individual effort. There remained only the power of combination.

At the outset, the companies took a determined stand against a recognition of this solidarity. They were certain—so they declared—of the loyalty of the vast majority of their men. The supposed grievances had no real existence. They would discuss individual complaints with individual employees. They would not tolerate the organization of their men by alien influences without a stake in the city of New York. They were prepared for a certain amount of dislocation, but their control of the men was such that, granted the effective protection of their property by the forces of the city, they were willing to insure the public that part of its interest which they deemed at stake—the right to means of transit.

It was quite clearly a feudal attitude. The worker has as much right to ask the advice of an industrial expert on the means of improving his conditions as has the employer to consult an efficiency engineer. It was entirely to mistake the fundamental character of modern industry to believe that the individual redress of grievances can be satisfactory to a community so complex as our own. It is unsatisfactory for the simple reason that it does not happen. "In present conditions," says Mr. Justice Holmes in a well known case, "a workman not unnaturally may believe that only by belonging to a union can he secure a contract that shall be fair to him. If that belief, whether right or wrong, may be held by a reasonable man, it seems to me that it may be enforced by law; in order to establish the equality of position between the parties in which liberty of contract begins." Mr. Shonts may regard the street railways as his "happy family"; but that is only to reveal his inadequate conception of happiness. Nor was it any more adequate to define the public interest in the street railway as no more than the right to be carried on the cars. The public is interested in the health of the workers and in their happiness, and that, in economic terms, involves an interest—even a controlling interest—in their wages and

hours of labor no less than in the conditions under which their work was performed.

The refusal to negotiate involved a strike and it became at once evident that Mr. Shonts's predictions were without basis in fact. He had failed to retain the loyalty of certainly half, and probably more than half, of his men. Their organization, and their loyalty to their organization became the main factor in the situation. It might be regretted; it could not be ignored. Mr. Shonts desired police protection for the cars he was able to run. He received it. He did not need it, for the simple reason that from the very outset the conduct of the men was simply admirable. Throughout, they showed themselves cautious, sober and determined. Though the presence of the police on the cars was a source of real uneasiness, they yet were satisfied that the withdrawal of their labor would sufficiently inconvenience the city to cause inquiry into the justice of their demands.

They were not disappointed. From the very outset Mayor Mitchel had kept in the closest touch with the situation. He had made himself acquainted with the facts. He had considered the issues and their consequences to the situation as a whole. He came to the problem with no rigid hypothesis. Throughout, his mind developed as the situation developed. He showed a sympathy, a rare power of imaginative insight, a quick grasp of the essentials involved which won him the immediate respect of both sides. More than that, he throughout never lost sight of the fact that he was the representative of the public, and that his every action must be taken in the context of a right regard for justice. Mr. Mitchel looked upon himself as something more than a means to the protection of property on the one hand or to the prevention of violence on the other. He had to take positive and constructive economic action. He had to interpret public rights in the terms of a fair settlement. The delicate skill with which he handled the situation is worthy of the highest confidence his courage has evoked.

Mr. Mitchel made it plain that he would not make the company a free gift of the city's powers. He would use the city as a factor in the settlement. He would use the forces at his disposal as a weight in the scale of what he deemed justice. The conception in his mind was that of a league to force industrial peace. If Mr. Shonts refused all investigation, all efforts after settlement, and declared for war, then the Mayor was willing to throw the tremendous strength of the city into the scale of labor. He made it clear that the influence of the city could only be given on the condition of the redress of substantial grievances. The force of the community

was for him not the beam of the scale but the weight which determines its just incidence.

In that light, his course was clear. There must be a conference at which difficulties could be frankly discussed. It must be on the basis of the facts there disclosed that his policy must, above all, be founded. The statesmanship of such an attitude was as clear as it was undeniable. The realization that the maintenance of public right involved the redress of justifiable complaint is a conception of which it is difficult to overestimate the far-reaching significance. Not merely its novelty, not merely the decisive stand that if the community is an arbitrator, it is also an arbitrator with a conscience, and a conscience that rusts from want of exercise, but the speed with which that attitude was translated into effective action, are strikingly impressive. And the facts were there. The men were worse paid than the employees of most street railways in the United States. Their hours were excessive, and that was the more dangerous when the heaviness of the traffic for which they were responsible was borne in mind. To such a strain it was clearly opposed to the public interest that they should be subjected. The facts of grievance established, the Mayor was wisely empirical in his interpretation of their solution. They clearly were a matter for patient and detailed investigation. In the heat which dispute must inevitably engender their satisfactory consideration was impossible.

But he went further. If reason could be found for the companies' refusal to treat with external organizations, they could not logically refuse to deal with a representative committee of their own men. Such a refusal would involve a feudalistic tyranny which no city could protect because no city could justify it. It was again this fine interpretation of public action in terms of a generalized public need which brought the problem to a successful conclusion. The patience and enthusiasm of himself and of Mr. Straus, the chairman of the Public Service Commission, finally obtained a settlement which both parties were willing to ratify.

The settlement does not in terms recognize the union; but it concedes the right of the companies' employees to organize, and it commits the companies to a treatment of difficulties with this representative body. The men, on their side, are given the right to summon to their assistance whatever expert counsel they may desire. Men like Mr. Mahon, for example, are put into the position of a possible consulting physician for the diagnosis of such cases as go beyond the skill of the local practitioner. It is with the employees that the company will directly deal; but they will deal with them in the full knowledge that behind their activity will

be the best advice organized labor can command. The men are to appoint a committee to discuss all grievances with the companies' officials. Such as they are unable satisfactorily to determine are to be submitted to three arbitrators—one named by each party and the third by their joint consent—for settlement. The committee of the men is to meet the companies' officials by August 20th, so that the vital term in the agreement—the recognition of collective bargaining—is given just that immediately vivid realization which will inspire the confidence of the men.

But there is a further clause to the settlement of which the significance is very great. To its terms are attached the signatures of Mayor Mitchel and of the chairman of the Public Service Commission. They are both, in short, in the full meaning of their official capacity made parties to the agreement. They stand as the effective guarantors of its realization. They are responsible for its complete maintenance. Their strength, that is to say, in the event of any future violation, whether on the part of the men, or of the companies, will be thrown into the scale against the offender. Here again the principle that, once substantial justice has been secured, the community is interested only in the enforcement of peace, but not until then, is very strikingly asserted. The Mayor makes it clear that the weapons of the city do not go to the first hand that calls for their use. They have the sacred character of the Roman fasces. They cannot be stained by association with injustice. The city abandons its attitude—a purely negative one—of passive impartiality for the constructive position that it is the fundamental business of the public to secure justice and to maintain it. That is what these signatures mean. That is what they must be made to symbolize in the lives of those who have been concerned in this issue.

We must make no mistake about it. This step is a decisive and novel departure in the control of industry. In Chicago, in Boston, in the Pullman strike, civic or federal intervention attempted no more than peace. In New York Mayor Mitchel has secured peace on terms of justice. He has rejected the syndicalist attitude. He has denied that the only parties to industrial controversies are the employers and the workers, who may fight out their problems to the universal detriment. He has insisted on reading industry in a public context. He has declared that there are principles of right to be enforced, and that it is the business of the public to enforce them. Such an attitude is as heartening as it is creative. It dispels the illusion—too long cherished both by capital and labor—that the public is a naked shivering thing which employs the police to keep the ring. It offers its

protection to those who will observe its standards, while it expresses those standards increasingly in terms of our common needs. It gives to itself exactly that stake in industry which its increasing complexity requires. It slays the effete fiction—of which the industrial consequences have been too often disastrous—that the neutrality of the community implies on its part a sentiment of impartial indifference. On the contrary, it defines neutrality in terms which reveal its determination to see to it that what is industrially right shall be made politically effective. The action of the city of New York in this crisis marks a moral landmark in industrial history.

Tainted Ballots

"I don't know what to do. I had no idea Mr. Hughes would come out for suffrage. I would never have joined the Hughes Alliance had I foreseen that. Shall I resign? I don't know yet; I can't tell what I shall do until I have talked it over with my husband. You see, he is a stanch Republican and so, of course, for Mr. Hughes. But I certainly do not care to be identified with an organization largely made up of suffragists. Nothing in the world would have caused me to join the Hughes Alliance had I realized that it was to be absolutely managed by suffrage women. It just shows how stupid women are to let themselves get entangled in any political organization. Why, I'm in an awful box."

THE box so described by a prominent member of the Guidon Club Opposed to Woman Suffrage should not, after all, be uncomfortably narrow for anti-suffrage logic. Anti-suffragists have been in just that kind of box ever since they became articulate, and have lived there complacently without knowing where they were. If a woman believes that women should not vote, and at the same time desires the election of Mr. Hughes and joins an organization to help bring it about, she can do so on only one theory. That theory is that indirect influence on other votes is sufficient to express her political preferences. And what should she care if some of those other votes happen to be women's? In a case of mere influence, one vote is as good as another, and no vote can be tainted if it is cast for the right man.

The real problem of the Guidon Club member is whether her desire that women shall not vote is so strong as to outweigh all other political considerations. She might reason with herself as follows: "My husband is a stanch Republican and desires the election of Mr. Hughes; I also desire the election of Mr. Hughes. But I believe more strongly than anything else that women should not vote. It would not be right for me to cast a ballot for Mr. Hughes, nor would it be right for other

women to do so. Yet if he is elected it will be with the help of many women's ballots, and if he is elected he will help give all women the vote. Therefore, it is not right that he should be elected. I must use my influence against his election; I must persuade my husband to vote for Mr. Wilson; I must try to defeat my own political desires." Such a beautiful self-cancellation should delight the suffragist voters and the suffragist candidate. It would be a nice test of the power of "influence" against the power of votes.

But surely, you say, this would be an unduly harsh use of logic to expect of a woman who does not glory in her political wisdom. Might she not, though opposing suffrage, still think some issues large enough to obscure her aversion? Well, let us see where that would lead her.

Suppose she agrees with Mrs. George W. Wickersham, who before Mr. Hughes came out for the Anthony amendment announced her support for him. Mrs. Wickersham proclaimed that, though she is an anti-suffragist, she wishes to "point out to all citizens of this country that the election of Mr. Hughes is imperative for our national safety, unity, prosperity and honor, and that this is a time when all citizens, men and women alike, should rally to America's call for a leader. . . . There are times and conditions in the political history of a country like ours when we must all unite on the big issues and agree to differ about the lesser ones." If one feels that way about the candidacy of Mr. Hughes, surely one should be willing to have him elected, even with the aid of women's votes. But what a confession is there! Mrs. Wickersham has admitted that the government of a country may be supremely important to its women. She has admitted that women may have, and indeed must sometimes have convictions about how that government should be administered. One infers that she might perhaps consent to die for the safety, unity, prosperity, and honor of her country. Is she unwilling for the same cause to drop a piece of paper into a slot?

The anti-suffrage dilemma is not caused by the accident that Mr. Hughes, who happens to be liked by conservative women, also happens to favor woman suffrage. The dilemma is caused by the curious twist of mind which makes a woman who is capable of opinions on politics believe at the same time that she should not have the means of making those opinions effective. A woman could be a logical anti-suffragist if she had faith that government has no effect on women. She could be a logical anti-suffragist if she had faith that though government does concern women, still her opinions on the way it is administered are worth nothing and should not count. But the moment a woman begins

to have convictions about politics, there is only one thing for her to do. If she wishes to justify her intelligence, she must announce her belief in woman suffrage.

Publicity for Income Returns

THE income tax, we may be quite sure, has become a permanent element in our federal financial system. It is improbable that any scheme of protective duties that could now be devised would suffice for the huge fiscal needs of the government, and no party would have the temerity to repeal the income tax and make good the resulting deficit by non-protective duties and consumption taxes of wide incidence. It therefore behooves us to make the income tax as just and as efficient as we can. Opinions may differ as to whether the schedule of rates ought to be raised, as proposed in the revenue bill now before Congress. There cannot be two opinions as to the desirability of reaching, as nearly as possible, all income lawfully subject to whatever tax rates are in force. How far have we succeeded in doing this? Possibly we reach one-half the income subject to the tax. This is perhaps as good a guess as any other; certainly the income that escapes taxation makes up a very large proportion. And it is only reasonable to demand that the government, when seeking a larger revenue through income taxation, should attempt to improve the efficiency of collection, as well as to raise the rates.

The best income-tax administration in the world arrives at efficiency only through patient accumulation of experience. At first it must rely very largely upon the statements of the taxpayers themselves. This is what we now rely on for business and professional incomes; and even for incomes derived from corporate employments or investments, and therefore taxable at the source, we have to rely upon personal statements for the levy of the progressive rates. A first year's operation of the tax thus provides us with a roll of taxpayers, some of whom have reported their full incomes, while others have understated theirs. Once on the roll it is hard to get off, unless you meet with financial disaster. It is also hard to lower the estimate of income you have once given. This roll, then, is a fairly stable element in the calculations of the income-tax administration. The work of subsequent years is to extend the roll by including those who had sought to evade taxation altogether and to raise to their true proportions incomes on the roll that have been understated.

Now, how efficient is the machinery we have at present for building up this income-tax roll?

We have collectors of internal revenue scattered rather sparsely over the country with a corps of assistants altogether too limited in number to perform the difficult and delicate task of checking up any considerable proportion of the statements of income submitted by the taxpayers. "Everybody" may know that Mr. Black is making and spending ten thousand a year, but the income-tax administration is most likely not to know it. Why does nobody suggest to the revenue collector that Mr. Black would bear investigation? Because of popular sympathy with Mr. Black? Not at all: few communities have deep sympathy for a man with \$10,000 a year who is trying to dodge taxes. The community simply does not know that Mr. Black is paying no income tax. For the revenue service is forbidden under heavy penalties to disclose the facts pertinent to the taxpayer's reported income situation.

Imagine the results of a system of full publicity. Each year, we will suppose, the local paper publishes the names of residents paying income tax. Would Mr. Black have the face to keep his name off the list altogether, or report his income at much less than its true amount? Remember, every income-tax payer in the community, and many who are not income-tax payers, would scan the list with intensest interest. It is not credible that Mr. Black's tax-dodging would escape everyone's eye, nor that the report of it would fail to reach the collector's ear. Of course there are men so secretive that no one suspects them of having income of taxable magnitude. But these men must live in a mean way, hoarding their wealth, and through estate taxes it would be possible for the state in the end to recover what is its due.

What good reason have we, then, for maintaining the principle of secrecy in income-tax returns? There is an accepted fiscal rule that the tax administration should reduce the inconvenience and injury incidental to revenue collection to the minimum. Excellent reasons may be advanced to show why taxes on business should be so administered as to reveal as little as possible. To publish the facts pertinent to a particular business enterprise might convey important information to competing business. It cannot be denied that occasionally a statement of the income of a business or a professional man might induce competition. But the cases are rare in which a quasi publicity has not already been established, as a basis of credit.

In older countries, where public policy recognizes social stratification, there is an additional reason for guarding the income secrets of the taxpayer. The social position of a worthy individual might be placed in jeopardy if he were forced to make public the actual meagreness of his income. Or,

where the sense of public obligation is highly developed, men entered in the published lists for very large incomes might be subjected to excessive solicitation from representatives of benevolent enterprises.

America recognizes no social stratification. Mr. Black may feel humiliated because he has been shown to have only ten thousand a year instead of fifteen thousand. Why should the American democrat, happy on \$1500 a year, care about such a foible of Mr. Black's? Mr. Brown may be dreadfully pestered by philanthropic societies when he is publicly placed high in the list of swollen incomes. His grief will not greatly move the democracy. The socialists would make capital out of the classifications they could draw. "A hundred incomes of a million and more; ten thousand incomes of between one-hundred thousand and a million; five million incomes of six hundred or less." It is improbable that the facts of the concentration of income are more disconcerting than the guesses that now pass for facts. But if this were not the case, and publication of the facts of distribution increased social unrest, we could not, as believers in democracy, approve the suppression of these facts.

Publicity alone will not give us an efficient income-tax machinery. We shall need also a much larger and better trained administrative personnel. Since we are sure to retain the income tax, and extend it, whatever the changes in the party complexion of our government, we ought to lose no time in laying the foundations for an expert service. But the most expert service, under the heterogeneous conditions of a vast and changing economic system like that of the United States, will make small headway against tax-dodging unless it is permitted to make the fullest practicable use of publicity.

The New **REPUBLIC** *A Journal of Opinion*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL

WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

The Rôle of the Middle West

EIGHT years ago in the Republican national convention at Chicago certain western delegates urged upon the convention the adoption of several amendments to the report of the committee on resolutions. Among these were proposals for the physical valuation of railway properties as a basis for government rate-making, a revision of the tariff on the basis of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, a permanent tariff commission, and planks favoring the popular election of senators and publication of campaign contributions and expenditures. Chairman Hopkins of the committee termed the proposals "Socialistic and Democratic," and although 114 votes were cast for the minority plank on popular election of senators, only 28 votes were given to the minority report when the final vote was taken on the adoption of the platform. Despite this rebuff the radical western Republicans accepted the leadership of Taft, placing reliance on the assertion that he was the political heir of Roosevelt, whom they had come greatly to admire, and attaching considerable weight to the assertion of the candidate in Milwaukee, "I can say that our party is pledged to a genuine revision, and as temporary head of that party and President of the United States, if it be successful in November, I expect to use all the influence that I have by calling immediately a special session and by recommendation to Congress secure a genuine and honest revision." In November the Middle West most emphatically rejected the claim of Mr. Bryan that he represented their call that the government be restored to the people. Three-fifths of Taft's electoral vote came from west of the Alleghenies, and outside of the South Bryan carried only Oklahoma, Colorado, Nebraska and Nevada.

From the day of Taft's inauguration, Republicans from the Middle West found much to criticize in his attitude toward matters that they considered of paramount importance at the time. In the organization of the new Congress twelve western Republicans cast their votes against Cannon for speaker, and thirty-one Republicans, all but three from the West, voted against the motion to adopt the rules of the former Congress. In the Senate ten western Republicans spoke and voted against the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. Much was said in the Senate debate of the Chicago platform and the subsequent utterances of the candidate. Middle-western representatives claimed that it was the leaders in Congress that were betraying the con-

fidence of those who elected the Republican ticket in 1908. In retort Senator Heyburn was finally provoked to say, "There is nothing in the platform of the Republican party that pledges us to reform either the Republican party or its principles."

The speech of Taft at Winona in the fall of 1909, in which he seemed to defend the tariff bill and its advocates, very definitely made the Middle West the "enemy's country." In 1910 the rules fight was renewed in the house, and the Norris resolution, which finally effected the overthrow of the old rules, was supported by forty-one Republicans. In the Senate a western group of eleven stood out against the party organization on twenty-five important roll-calls. In the autumn of the year men in sympathy with the revolt within the party named candidates or wrote platforms in all but four of the Republican states west of the Mississippi river as well as in Michigan, Indiana and Wisconsin. The results in November revealed the strength of the insurgency. With two exceptions the West returned the "insurgents" and they added to their number new members who had campaigned for "a scientific revision of the tariff," "more direct control of legislative procedure" and "a more careful supervision of corporate power."

Early in 1911 the National Progressive Republican League was organized with the professed object of capturing control of the party. It was a western organization and its hope was the defeat of Taft's renomination. In April Senator La Follette was agreed upon as a candidate to represent the western interests. His active campaign was opened in July, and in October a convention of three hundred delegates in Chicago endorsed his candidacy.

Developments in the sixty-second Congress emphasized the purpose of the insurgents. They continued the fight upon rules of procedure in both houses. Seventeen, all western men, voted against Cannon, the Republican caucus nominee. In the Senate thirteen western Republicans protested against the committee appointments and method of selection. Finally, the bulk of western Republicans opposed the reciprocity agreement that Taft had concluded with Canada, and in the House a smaller group united with the Democrats in passing the "woolen bill" and a 35 per cent reduction on iron and steel.

There were those who said when the campaign year opened that the Republicans faced in 1912 the problems that had confronted the Democrats in 1896. In the sense that the eastern and western ele-

ments of the party were in disagreement, this was true. But in the matter of disagreement there was a wide difference. The earlier cries for honesty and economy in government, for "a fair field for all" and a denunciation of the corruption and cowardice of party organization—these were repeated. But in place of one panacea that should change all this, the candidate of western interests suggested a platform that should include direct nominations and elections, income and inheritance taxes, parcels post, physical valuation of railways and "trusts" as a basis for government control.

With the renomination of President Taft the insurgent movement became merged and lost sight of in the formation of a Progressive party and the nomination of former-President Roosevelt. In November the middle-western areas gave heavy majorities for Roosevelt. In more than half of the counties in the Middle West in which Roosevelt's vote was greater than Taft's the Progressive vote exceeded that cast for Wilson. An examination of the vote by counties in the Middle West and a comparison of the distribution with that of 1908 makes it certain that, with the exception of a section of the vote in Wisconsin, comparatively few progressive or insurgent Republicans voted for Wilson.

With the opening of the Wilson administration there appeared evidences of a revival of insurgent Republicanism as distinct from Progressivism that had temporarily eclipsed it during the campaign. This was shown in support by western Republicans of certain Democratic proposals. A group in the Senate evidenced a willingness to work with the liberal Democrats in the revision of the tariff. Roll-calls revealed the insurgent group as distinct from regular Republicans. Senator La Follette cast his vote in favor of the Underwood bill on its passage.

But this coöperation was of short duration. With the growing popularity of President Wilson and repeated evidences of his control of his party, western Republicans tended to drop away from support. In view of Wilson's earlier utterances insurgents were surprised at his professions of willingness to govern with aid of Democrats only. At the same time the attacks of the western group upon leaders in the Republican organization became less frequent and less bitter. The rise to first importance of matters of foreign policy not only subordinated the issues that they had disagreed upon but also decreased the possibility of the choice of a middle-western man as the leader for 1916. The rank and file returned to the Republican camp, as was shown clearly in the congressional vote of 1914.

In the preliminaries of the present presidential campaign it was difficult to distinguish the "insurgent" Republicans, either leaders or delegates. Even the Roosevelt candidacy excited no "insur-

gent" response. What there was was a personal response. No fight was made in the preliminary canvass upon any candidate. Root, so distasteful to western delegates in 1912, was widely acclaimed in the West. Much was heard of his ability, very little indeed of his past record as an organization representative. Hughes has been accepted by the former insurgent leaders, but little has been said, as yet, of his liberal Republicanism, and much of his efficiency. Fairbanks takes the place formerly occupied by Sherman of New York and there is scarce a murmur of dissent.

On the surface insurgency is dead. The issues that it raised to the importance of national problems are not now vital. There are two possible explanations of the present situation in the Middle West. First, the mass of voters that supported the insurgent movement have forsaken the cause and are willing to aid in restoring the Republican organization to power in order that a different course may be pursued in foreign affairs. Second, the mass of voters that have long been interested in "reform" are satisfied with Wilson's conduct of government and particularly with the Democratic measures on tariff and money and the "trusts," including the Clayton act and the Rural Credits act, and prefer to throw their support to his reelection rather than to restore the regular Republicans to power. In either case the disappearance of insurgency is perfectly natural.

The foregoing survey would seem to point to the second explanation as the more probable. Large sections in the Middle West with a real interest in reform of political methods and practices have nevertheless feared to use the Democratic party as a means to attain their desires. This has been shown repeatedly in every election for the past twenty years. These sections of the electorate endeavored to achieve their desires through the agency of the Republican party. This brought on the insurgent movement which prepared the way and made possible the middle-western phase of the Progressive movement in 1912. But the Middle West was Progressive Republican rather than Progressive. In the present campaign these elements find no opportunity afforded them to indicate their adherence to the spirit of insurgency except by voting for Wilson. Were they liberals or progressives they might accept Hughes with heartiness. But having such a background as has been sketched, and with the former fear of Democratic rule shown to be ill founded, they turn naturally to the man and the party that has voiced and in some matters made progress upon the demands of the middle-class Middle West. Moreover, the attitude of Wilson, both in diplomatic matters and upon the issue of preparedness, has been vastly pleasing to the large body of

sentiment in the interior of the continent. His utterances have seemed familiar to those long accustomed to the point of view in matters of foreign policy of such men as Bryan and La Follette. In the recent attempts in the Senate to limit the size of the naval appropriations it is not without significance that the speeches and votes of the opponents of the bill, Democrats and Republicans alike, came from the Middle West, and of these the Republicans were the more numerous.

Twenty years ago there were those who saw in the union of the South and West in support of Bryan a new nationalism opposed to eastern sec-

tionalism. The new Democracy of that campaign failed of success because the Middle West did not desert the Republican party. In the present campaign it seems at least possible, if not probable, that the insurgent Middle West will unite with the South in support of Woodrow Wilson. Should a majority mandate come to him and his party because of this added support, it may be said not only that this is the first complete Democratic majority victory since 1858, but also that out of the Middle West has at last come to dominance another significant movement in American politics.

EDGAR E. ROBINSON.

Amateur Diplomacy Abroad

THE time of the wise, according to an English essayist of the middle nineteenth century, is chiefly occupied in repairing the mischief done by the good. The wise are always scarce and have never been so scarce in Europe as at present, but the good seem to be more numerous than ever, and among them are many Americans. For good Americans no longer wait until they die to come to Paris. All the Americans over here are ardently pro-Ally, or at least, pro-French, and that is as it should be. Those who have lived in France could hardly be anything else; if I had not been a devoted admirer of France and the French all my life, ten years' residence in France would have made me one. As it is, my English friends accuse me of thinking only of France in regard to the present war and of unpatriotically ignoring the interests of my own country. So I cannot criticize Americans for doing likewise; I would merely venture to suggest that they should temper their zeal with discretion.

Nearly all the Americans I meet here cannot find words to express their contempt for President Wilson. They declare that the whole American people is inspired by a passionate longing to fling itself into the war and is restrained only by the President's white-livered obstinacy. The French find it rather difficult to believe this; after nearly two years' experience of this war, it passes their understanding that anybody that has kept out of it hitherto should want to be in it. Still, they think that Americans ought to know best the state of mind of their own countrymen and they can but accept their description of it as a true one. The result is that, while Mr. Wilson is accused by the pan-German press of favoring the Allies under cover of a sham neutrality, some of his own fellow-countrymen are leading the French to believe that he is their enemy. I cannot think that the propagation of this view of American

opinion and of Mr. Wilson's policy, which seems to me, so far as I can judge, to be an entirely false one, is likely to better the already excellent relations between France and the United States. After all, it seems at least possible that Mr. Wilson may continue to govern the United States for another four years; and, that being so, it might be wiser on the part of Americans in Europe not to do all in their power to discredit him.

The views of Americans living in Europe might be discounted; many of them have been so long out of their own country that they might be expected to be out of touch with American opinion. Unfortunately, the same view of American opinion and of Mr. Wilson's policy is offered to us by Americans fresh from the United States, who have crossed the Atlantic to tell us what the American people are thinking. You in America have an enormous advantage over us in Europe in the fact that you have no professional diplomatists. Your ambassadors are not diplomatists, they do not profess to be diplomatists and they never attempt to play the diplomatic game. Therein lies the secret of their success and the guaranty of your security. Had you had professional diplomatists as ambassadors, you would probably by now be at war with one or other of the belligerent groups, perhaps with both. But, mischievous as is the professional diplomatist, the amateur diplomatist is, if possible, even more mischievous; he does not even know the game that he is trying to play, he is under no control and he can not be recalled. And he is so thoroughly and dangerously good.

At the present moment a distinguished American architect, Mr. Whitney Warren, is almost universally regarded in France as the chief and best authorized representative of American opinion. My wicked American friends in Paris—I mean, of

course, my colleagues of the press—tell me that this would cause great astonishment in the United States, where Mr. Whitney Warren's political influence is neither great nor extensive. Yet the whole French press, the members of the Institute, the leading politicians, the most eminent representatives in France of literature, science and art, will tell you with one voice that through the mouth of Mr. Whitney Warren speaks the great American people. I do not know why they think so; the only reason that they have for their belief, so far as I can discover, is that Mr. Warren himself has said it. In normal times we should hesitate to take a man at his own valuation; but we are not normal in Europe at present. Human beings, as Mr. Bertrand Russell has recently told us, are normally guided by impulse, not by reason, and use their reason only to attempt to justify their impulses and to prove that they are good and the impulses of other people bad. The few exceptions to this rule are the prophets whom we stone in their time and whose sepulchres we build after their death. Why is Bernard Shaw suspected and distrusted by the majority of Englishmen? Merely because he is guided by reason and makes us shiver by cold douches of that "most uncommon commodity, commonsense." What is abnormal in Europe is that we have ceased to use our reason even as an afterthought and that intellect has descended to a level that should satisfy even M. Bergson. Besides, the impulses by which we are guided are more and more those of primitive man. The almost universal acceptance in England early in the war of the great Archangelic myth—that a large Russian army had arrived in England—was only the most conspicuous example of the mentality that the war has created or rather resuscitated. Thousands of sane persons swore that they had seen the Russians and firmly believed it. To doubt the existence of the mythical Russians or the truth of any other legend, however preposterous, was to stamp oneself as a pro-German.

One of the characteristics of primitive man—or at any rate of the contemporary savage who is at present the nearest approach to him—is to take people at their own valuation. If you tell savages that you have divine powers, it is almost certain that they will believe you and the performance of a single conjuring trick will make it quite certain; they will then either worship you or eat you, according to the custom of their tribe—folk-lorists tell us that the two ceremonies have often much the same significance. The habit of eating our gods has not yet been revived in Europe; instead, we entertain them at a banquet. Mr. Whitney Warren has been entertained at many banquets; he has lectured to the Institute of France; interviews with him fill columns of the newspapers and even the serious *Temps* de-

votes leading articles to his utterances. All this must give a great deal of innocent pleasure to Mr. Whitney Warren, and there could be no serious objection to it had not Mr. Warren, with the best possible intentions and in the most complete good faith, led French opinion very much astray. He seemed to have come over this time in order to enlighten us about the forthcoming presidential election, and he and other Americans succeeded in convincing the whole French press that Mr. Roosevelt would certainly be chosen as the Republican candidate and as certainly be elected President of the United States. The result was that the whole French press, from the *Temps* downwards, adopted Mr. Roosevelt as the candidate of the Allies and insinuated that Mr. Hughes was a pro-German. To my knowledge, one at least of the more serious papers hesitated to express an opinion about a matter which, after all, is one for America, and was induced to do so only by Mr. Warren's positive assertions that Mr. Roosevelt's selection by the Republican convention could not be doubted.

I should have supposed that, in any case, an American would have been better advised than to push the French press into interfering in a matter of American internal politics. So far as I can judge, European opinion has little or no influence in America, but, if the opinion of foreign newspapers could have any influence on the decision of an American party convention, I should expect it to have an unfavorable influence on the chances of the candidate supported by the foreign press. As it is, the result of amateur diplomacy is that the Republican party is believed in France to be pro-German, and the choice of the American electors is supposed to lie between a friend of Germany and a man whom nearly all the Americans in France denounce as a weak-kneed shuffler. It seems that this fiasco is not enough and that an attempt has been made—again by Americans—to get the American correspondents in Paris to put themselves in touch with a sort of committee of eminent Frenchmen who would advise them as to what they are to say about the presidential election. Could the unwisdom of the good go further? Of course, the American correspondents, who, as I have said, are wicked and wise, have not the least intention of lending themselves to a scheme so silly and so obviously injurious to the interests alike of France and of the United States.

This is no great matter and no permanent harm will be done to the relations of the two great republics, whose traditional friendship is based on too solid a foundation to be shaken by the blundering diplomacy of a few well meaning persons. Those Frenchmen who know the United States know well enough that, whether Mr. Wilson or Mr. Hughes is elected President, American policy will continue to

be as friendly to France as it has always been. But it would be a pity, nevertheless, that America should be even temporarily misunderstood by any part of the French public, and a still greater pity that the misunderstanding should be caused by Americans. American sympathy is keenly appreciated in France and it has been practically and lavishly manifested; Americans have shown the generosity that is an American characteristic and have poured money into ambulance work and relief funds; the American hospital for French wounded at Neuilly is a model of its kind. All this will never be forgotten by the French people, but that is no reason why the French people should be misinformed. If I might venture to offer a word of advice to the well intentioned persons who have taken upon themselves the superfluous task of improving Franco-American relations, it would be: Let well enough alone.

ROBERT DELL.

Metchnikoff

MEDICINE has long been a fertile mother of the natural sciences. Need for relief from pain and from grievous loss early drove men to seek aid in the earth and in growing things. Gradually the seekers became more interested in the objects they sought than in ailing mankind. Chemistry and botany and zoölogy were at last pursued for the satisfaction of the devotees of pure knowledge. Not infrequently, however, new facts failed to remain in isolation—ether was used as an anæsthetic, the aniline dyes helped in the struggle against tuberculosis—and thereby the daughter sciences returned to the primary motive of relieving man's estate. Sometimes, also, the investigator in a "pure" science found that his special interests led him back to medicine itself. So Pasteur, the chemist, revolutionized our intelligence regarding infectious diseases, and Metchnikoff, the zoölogist, first revealed important features of biological immunity.

It was in 1882 that Metchnikoff began reporting his studies of the action of the white corpuscles or leucocytes of the blood in protecting the body from disease, studies which at his hands, and at the hands of other investigators who followed him, have continued to be highly important and fruitful to this day. Earlier observers had noted that these corpuscles might contain bacteria, but it was supposed that the mobilization of the corpuscles at a point of bacterial inflammation was a means of spreading rather than of checking the infection. Metchnikoff suggested, however, that the leucocytes actively surround or incorporate the bacteria, destroy them by digesting them, and thus protect the rest of the or-

ganism from invasion. It is significant of the interrelations of the sciences that the fundamental observations on which this conclusion was based were made on a minute, transparent water-flea, *Daphnia*. In this little creature, whose life processes are apparently far removed from those of man and his relatives, the struggle between hostile invaders and the body's protectors was first made evident. Metchnikoff was able to prove that the outcome of infection depends wholly on the completeness with which the parasitic organisms are surrounded by the white corpuscles. Soon afterwards he discovered that by this process of "phagocytosis" frogs and mammals also are capable of combating experimental bacterial infection. Although the phagocytic theory of immunity at first met vigorous opposition, its opponents have gradually yielded, until now it is generally admitted that many forms of natural resistance to disease are best explained by the protective agency of the leucocytes. Even the immunity dependent on the fluid portion of the blood, due to the development in it of antitoxin, has not escaped the strong suspicion that it too results from a substance liberated from injured or stimulated leucocytes. The researches instigated by Metchnikoff's studies in the field of immunity alone have led directly or indirectly to revelations of new facts highly valuable to medical science; and investigations now in progress, thirty-four years since Metchnikoff's first reports, are proving still further the fecundity of the idea that the white cells of the blood are the body's protective militant forces.

Another important service to medicine with which Metchnikoff's name, as well as that of his colleague, Roux, will long be associated, was that of first reproducing syphilis in a lower animal, the chimpanzee. It was in 1903 that this success was published from the Pasteur Institute. The procedure was promptly confirmed by other experimenters. Suddenly this ancient pestilence of mankind was made subject to experimental attack. Active researches were started immediately in all directions by eager investigators, and in a few years animal experimentation, which had proved of measureless value in other fields, began to yield knowledge the importance of which for human welfare cannot be exaggerated. In 1905 the organism causing the disease was described by Schaudinn and Hoffmann, and Metchnikoff was able to demonstrate its presence in his animals; shortly thereafter a blood test for the disease was elaborated by Wassermann; and then Ehrlich discovered a drug of first-rate importance for successful treatment. Never in the history of medicine was a scourge to human kind, an affliction resting heavily upon the innocent and the guilty alike, more dramatically alleviated. It was a proper testimonial to the chief agents of our knowl-

edge and control of syphilis, and also a fitting recognition of their other achievements, that, in 1908, the Nobel Prize in medicine was divided between Ehrlich and Metchnikoff.

The solid achievements which may properly be credited to Metchnikoff, his discoveries in the biology of disease, will probably be his chief claim to permanent remembrance. It is possible, however, that his more speculative writings brought him personally a satisfaction equal to his hard conquests in the territory of facts. After an investigator has seen his pet ideas battered or roughly destroyed by unruly facts there is agreeable relaxation to be found in letting the imagination play where the facts have not yet appeared, or at best are only distant vague shapes. In two volumes, which have been translated from French to English, "The Nature of Man" (1903) and "The Prolongation of Life" (1908), the philosophic reflections of the great biologist are gathered. As the subtitle of the first volume was "Studies in Optimistic Philosophy," and as the second volume likewise was an inquiry into the conditions for happy as well as for prolonged existence, the popular interest in these writings was natural enough. Furthermore, life and sex and death and the fear of death, which were here dealt with, present problems perennially baffling and fascinating. And although Metchnikoff declared that "The Nature of Man" was addressed "to disciplined minds, and in especial to biologists," his language was so simple and his style so clear that many besides biologists found his ideas provocative if not convincing.

It must be confessed that Metchnikoff's optimistic philosophy has in it much that persons without disciplined minds would find depressing. His point of view is primitively biological, and his manner of attack on other systems is rough and inconsiderate of cherished sentiments. Ancient philosophies and the great religions of the world are dismissed as poor makeshift efforts at finding comfort and consolation in a world filled with difficulties and unhappiness.

These troubles of mankind Metchnikoff attributes to certain "disharmonies," certain maladjustments in our bodily organization, which disturb the workings of the organism as a whole. Useless hairs with follicles liable to dangerous infection; redundant wisdom teeth, a source of pain and disease; a vestigial vermiform appendix endangering life; a superfluous large intestine, the seat of harmful bacterial decomposition; ill timed instincts, especially that of reproduction, which appears precociously and remains after fitness for its exercise has ceased; and premature death, death approached in pain, sickness and fear—such are the sources of our discontent and pessimism, according to the biological

philosopher. His optimism lies in a simple trust that science can change all this. And since premature death is, in his view, the greatest disharmony of all, he addresses himself to that. Senility should be natural, instead of being, as it is now, usually pathological. Toxic substances, such as the poison of syphilis, alcohol, and the products of putrefaction in the large intestine, lower the native capacities of various tissues and organs of the body. These structures then become subject to attack by phagocytes, and the deterioration and destruction that result lead to a morbid and doddering old age. The ideal existence would be one in which a long period of senescence would be passed in effective labor and in vigorous health, until a sense of satiety of life develops, and an "instinct for death" makes preparation for death itself. Both fear of death and the thought of immortality would thereby be abolished, and man would be saved from his greatest anxieties. And since the acid of sour milk will check intestinal putrefaction, sour milk should be regularly drunk to postpone senility and to preserve youthful vigor. Was ever a simpler substitute for the consolations of philosophy seriously proposed!

Criticism of Metchnikoff's speculations is not difficult. His list of useless structures is only part of a much longer list, which has been growing gradually less as we have learned more concerning our bodily structure and functions. Minute organs long regarded as relics of embryonic life have been proved absolutely essential for continued existence. May we not reasonably expect that the process of enlightenment will continue, and that further discoveries will reveal that apparent "disharmonies" are really parts of larger harmonies? Furthermore, the claim that life is shortened by chemical products produced by bacterial action in the large intestine is not supported by reliable evidence. And it has been proved that the mere swallowing of a little sour milk or of sour-milk tablets is insufficient to maintain the condition which was assumed to result therefrom; the proper food must be present for the lactic acid bacilli to work upon. But even if vigor should be thus continued, there is no reason to suppose that healthy, energetic and effective men would come to the point of wishing to die. These comments, however, are made on the biological stratum of Metchnikoff's own argument. A more serious indictment of his suggestions is found in his failure to perceive the larger "disharmonies" of existence—the painful stresses that sunder the nonconformist from his social environment, the tyrannies of industry and of government, and the tragic struggles imposed by conflicting duties. No biological panacea mitigates such conflicts. Rather than endure them, life itself must often be surrendered and even in vigorous youth it may be surrendered cheerfully.

The stimulating and interesting character of Metchnikoff's views, however, is due precisely to his ingenuous maintenance of the biological attitude. A biologist he was, and one who had accomplished much for humanity by his labors. Without doubt he magnified the capability of purely biological methods to solve hyperbiological problems, and he extended biological concepts into realms too complicated for their simplicities. With his implicit faith in the efficacy of science, he seems, furthermore, to have thought little of the intractability of human nature. He apparently overlooked man's persistent inclination to see the better way and to approve of it, but to follow the worse. In these attitudes, how-

ever, was he not disclosing the limitations set upon him by a singleness of purpose which controlled his entire career? For through all his earlier years biological research alone held his attention and disciplined his thinking. Tasks that interfered with it he ceased to perform, positions which interrupted it he refused to accept, his share of the Nobel Prize he promptly applied to investigation. Whatever may be the final judgment of his theories regarding human nature and its problems of evil, there can only be the highest respect for his loyalty to the ideals of the investigator in science, and gratitude for his substantial and widely beneficent discoveries.

WALTER B. CANNON.

The Lot of the Inventor

"THIEVES! Sharks! Muttonheads!"
I had not been aware of my companion, except for a dim, uninterested recognition of the fact that a tall man, very Yankee in outline, had remained with me on the upper deck of the Sound boat when all the other passengers had fled below to escape a few drops of rain. Soliloquizing, however, is nearly a lost art, and naturally excites one's attention. I turned my chair so as to command a good view of the soliloquist, who was leaning against the rail and looking toward the great glow of light on the western clouds that indicated the direction of New York.

"Thieves! Scoundrels! Idiots!"

The soliloquist's voice was low, and I could catch only the words of special emphasis. Why should a man be hurling such epithets at the cloudy halo of New York? Was it drink? No. There was a certain erectness in the man's carriage, a certain angularity in his lines, that bespoke the total abstainer. Was it a woman? No. His face had the texture of one shaved only once a week and his clothes were such as are selected by men who find difficulty in remembering that there are women in the universe. Was he a bit out of joint mentally? Apparently not. He had a very fine, smooth brow, an aquiline nose and formidable chin, and his eyes were as round and gray and piercing as an eagle's.

"Pirates! Bandits!"

"I beg your pardon, sir," I ventured. "You seem to be thinking of New York. I'm interested."

He turned to me with a look of surprise. "New York? Yes, I was thinking of New York. Den of spiders. Old fat fellows; they sit there and spin and watch, and we fool flies go buzzing up to them to get sucked out. That's how New York lives."

"Perhaps," I replied doubtfully. "But I've

lived in New York, and it never occurred to me I was a spider."

"You weren't. You were just one of the spider's parasites. That is the way with most New Yorkers. Here is how it is. New York doesn't produce anything. But from all over the country men who have found means of producing something—mines, railway projects, inventions—come in a steady stream to New York, to get robbed. That's where your big fellows make their money. Of course they have to divide up with their friends and relatives, with the politicians, real-estate men, hotel keepers and such. And then these divide up with fellows still further down, who have to dance like the dickens to get their shares, and think they earn them. That's you. But just the same, all the money really comes from those muttonheads that keep coming in from the country with ideas, to be robbed. That's me."

"So they robbed you?"

"That's just what they did." He seated himself in the chair beside me. "Now, I'll tell you just how they do it: Maybe you can learn to be a spider yourself, and not just a parasite. Suppose you have an idea to sell, an idea with millions in it, and you can prove it. You have a letter from your local banker to, say, Mr. Clinton. Says Mr. Clinton, 'Sorry, but there's too much risk in your proposition. I'll give you a card to Mr. Shultz.' It takes you three or four days to find Mr. Shultz. Says Mr. Shultz: 'Your idea may have something in it, but I can't see it. But I'll make an appointment for you with Mr. Loewe.' You're a week in finding Mr. Loewe. Says Mr. Loewe, 'Excuse me, but I am terribly pestered with cranks who think they have valuable ideas. But I'll give you just one minute: what have you got to sell? No, don't go. I'll give you a letter to Mr. McGrath.' In time you find Mr.

McGrath. He hears you through, and says he doesn't see how he can do anything, but he'll see you again Monday week, three o'clock sharp. You come at three, and he keeps you waiting until five. He's been thinking over your proposition, he says, and he's a gambler, he's willing to take a chance, even if everybody will call him a fool for doing it. So he has fixed up a scheme, with bonds and first preferred stock and second preferred and common and God knows what else; all you've got to do is to put down your name. You're pretty discouraged by this time and ready to take anything. You come away, figuring that your idea will have to earn nineteen dollars for McGrath for every one it earns for you, and McGrath gets his nineteen dollars first. That's rough, but when you begin really to get mad is when you find that McGrath and Loewe and Schultz and Clinton are partners, and have run you about from office to office just to break your spirit and lower your price."

"Still," I objected, "these men are putting up their money and if the project fails they will suffer a material loss. All you will actually suffer is the disappointment of an idea proved worthless."

"There's where you're entirely wrong. Why, I spent over \$100,000 on the preliminary work. What do you think McGrath and the rest are putting up? Just \$50,000. It's a ten million dollar corporation, but the idea itself has to make up the rest of the capital. I get half a million of common stock. Come on. I'll show you something."

I followed him to his stateroom. He opened a black leather bag and produced a handful of little square samples of cloth. "What's this one?"

"Some kind of canvas," I guessed.

"What's this?"

"Worsted." I plucked at the threads trying to appear expert. "Not all wool, I should judge."

"What's this?" It was a fine white cloth and felt gritty as you rolled it between your fingers.

"Irish linen?"

"And this?" It was the most gossamer-like fabric I had ever seen. Silk, of course, but what kind?

"It looks very much like a Formosan silk," I ventured.

"Well, you're wrong on all of them. They're all wood pulp. That's the idea I've been trying to sell."

"Why, that's impossible," I replied. "Look at these ravelings. They are natural fibre, that's plain. You couldn't possibly make fibres of this strength out of wood pulp."

"And why not? Can't I work with the same molecular material nature works with? I can't arrange it in cells, but can't I produce a molecular arrangement having equal cohesive power? Haven't

I got an advantage over nature in the matter of binders? I can use any that gives increased strength; nature has to limit herself to those that won't kill cell growth. That's why I can make a stronger and finer fibre than nature can possibly make." He handed me the sample of gossamer texture. "Tear it."

I tore the sample. It was real silk. The invention was a fake, I was convinced.

"How cheap can you make these fabrics?" I inquired politely.

"The woolen, linen, and coarse cottons I can make for almost nothing. You see, I don't have to weave them. I make them just like paper and imitate the texture of cloth. See this sample. Unravel it if you can."

I plucked at the thread ends in a piece of flannel. They refused to run even a millimetre. I tore the sample. The rent followed zigzag lines.

"Heavens!" I exclaimed. "What is going to happen to the cotton and woolen industries?"

"Well, I had figured they'd have to stop planting cotton. Cotton would become a weed, and those farmers down South would be thanking God for the boll weevil. As for wool, I figured that the agricultural colleges would have to breed up a naked sheep. But those New York financiers have fixed all that. They aren't going to allow me to make any of the cheap stuffs. We're going to concentrate on this fine cloth, which is dearer to make than silk. They don't care to make good warm suits so cheap that poor people would never need to go cold or ragged. No, it's the demand of the rich they are after, and to get it, we've got to keep my invention out of reach of the poor. Dudes will get thinner socks, fine ladies will get thinner waists than they've ever worn before. And that's all I've accomplished, by my twenty years of work. Your financiers have turned me into just a silk worm."

The inventor paused dejectedly for a moment. Then his face brightened. "Well, I don't care much about that invention, anyway. I can't keep up much interest in an invention, once it's done. My weakness. I've got a garret full of inventions I've never even tried to sell. There's just one thing in the world I'm interested in, and that's leather."

He opened his bag and produced a long strip of black leather. "What do you think of that for artificial leather?"

I manipulated the strip suspiciously.

"You've given me the wrong sample," I said. "This is real leather."

"What makes you think so?"

"The smell."

"Oh, I imitated that. When I first made this leather it was odorless. But your financiers said

that wouldn't do. So I told them I could make it smell as bad as they pleased. You know what this smell is? Dilute Russian glue and quebracho extract."

I bent the sample and twisted it, and, by permission, cut off a corner of it, without arriving at certainty.

"If this isn't real leather," I said, "it's a wonderful invention. It would deceive anybody. But will it wear?"

"Wear? This bag is made of it. Look at it. I've carried it around for three years."

I took the bag and turned it round and round, looking for scratches or cracks. Not one. It might have been carried around for three years, but there seemed to be no reason for believing it.

"You must handle your baggage very carefully," I said. "Now if I were to smash this bag against the edge of the door, as a porter might, the leather would crack, wouldn't it?"

"I don't think it would. No, don't try it. You probably don't see many men of my kind, and don't realize what kind of chemical compounds we're likely to be working with when we're on problems like this. High explosives, a lot of them. Let me tell you about an incident that happened to me six years ago. I went down to New York to try to interest the financiers in my leather. Of course they wouldn't believe in it; thought they could buy it from me for nothing. And when I held out they tried to find all kinds of fault with it. 'It's too brittle, you couldn't cover a square corner with it,' they'd say. And I'd call their attention to my bag. Well, what do you think? One of those impudent old money bags walked right over to my bag and gave it a kick. Bang! Off went his feet! 'See,' he rolled up his sleeve, here's where the heel of his shoe hit me. Well, sir, that set me back years. There wasn't a financier that would let me come near him."

"It's wonderful how those financiers hang together," I remarked, depositing the bag very gently on the floor and wishing myself far away, on dry land.

"Yes, isn't it? If they'd given me a chance, I'd have revolutionized the whole leather business by this time. I can imitate every kind of leather there is, and I can make an entirely new product as superior to natural leather as natural leather is superior to paper. I can make you a pair of shoes, without seams, for twenty-five cents, and I can imitate the seams for a fraction of a cent more. For ten cents I can make working gloves that will last a year and the finest kid gloves for twenty cents. But do you suppose they will let me do it?"

"No, of course not," I admitted. "There are

the cattlemen and the beef trust and the shoe-machinery trust and the shoe factories. Your artificial leather would produce a terrible commercial crisis."

"Yes, that's what they say. But let me show you something they do let me make." He drew from his pocket what looked like a handful of little, buff buttons. On closer examination I saw that they were leather washers, concave on one side, and nearly hemispherical on the other.

"What do they use those for?" I asked.

"Hanged if I know. I was working on a machine for something else and I saw it would make these things. So I ran off a few dozen of them, just for fun, and sent them around to my friends. I got a letter from a big concern in New York asking me to call when I came down. I went around there yesterday, and what do you think? They gave me \$10,000 for that machine." He drew from his bill case a paper for my perusal. It was the contract of conveyance of the patent.

"Ten thousand dollars for a machine to make these little things," I reflected aloud. "Real money? Did they let you take all that money away from New York?"

"That's what they did. You've been doubting me all along, just like a financier. You're in doubt about that money now. Do you know \$1,000 bills when you see them?"

"My hands are up," I admitted. "Who can doubt a man who carries ten of these bills around in his pocket? Still, I should think it would be easier for you to imitate ten thousand dollars than to get it for those tiny washers."

The inventor rolled the washers around in his palm. "What I've got in here"—he tapped his forehead—"is the clothing and shoes of the world. What they let me make is a little thing like this, good for God knows what. Queer, isn't it, that this is all the use they can find for a man like me."

I rose. Suddenly the cloud passed from the inventor's face and he was again erect, buoyant.

"Come and see me in Boston. I'll show you something superb. It's a motor. Those Frenchmen think they've got miracles of motors on their aeroplanes. Wait till they see mine; the best motors they've got will be junk. Say, she's a beauty! She generates twice the power and weighs half as much."

"But they won't let you make it," I suggested pessimistically.

"That's where you're wrong. I'm not touching your financiers. I don't have to: I've got the British government on the string. There'll be no monkey business this time. It's for use in war."

ALVIN S. JOHNSON.

Getting Divorced

IN his preface to "Getting Married" Shaw insists that the single question one should ask of a person who wants a divorce is whether he or she is really in earnest. No mutual consent, no grievance, no question of children, should enter into the separation. Do you really mean business? That is the only consideration. If so, the marriage service should read, "So long as you both shall love"; marriage would not be a bond from without, but from within. Like much of G. B. S. it is more shocking to custom than to reason. We should not be dismayed if we were told that it is a poor affection which still claims the right to hold its object by compulsion, when all response is gone. Most of those whom Shaw's dictum outrages would be the first to protest against such a love; they are souls who adore sentiment, though they decline to examine its consequences; in short, they are sentimentalists. The implications of their highest ideals, were they faced with them baldly and separated from their source, would be grossly shocking to them.

There are, of course, more difficulties than G. B. S. is quite willing to admit, when the couple has children. Let us suppose, however, that there is enough money to go round even though the two be separated; that is the presupposition always tacitly made when good bourgeois discuss together. Then, too, we must of course lay aside any religious scruples; we must determine to learn what are the sanctions, moral and economic, which should make us adhere to an indissoluble marriage. If we have a childless couple with ample means, one of whom has a settled wish to be separated from the other, is there any reason why he should be compelled to live on, either through social stigma or by law?

Well, the law already gives up the task. All the law says is that the one who leaves shall live celibate, an incentive, it would seem, to what the law affects to regard with censure. The alternative seems scarcely tolerable to anyone who faces it with the least imagination.

But, they say, the knowledge of this limitation cements affection and moors fast the fickle. Have we ever seriously put that query in its bare form? It is no more than to say that because you cannot have another spouse, your heart is welded to this. Perhaps so; the eyes that are forbid to roam may find a solace nearby which would not else seem so sweet. Yet I suspect human nature is more wayward; compulsion, at least in song and story, does bar the heart, and love will find a way. If bound, those that are faithful, they will be faithful still, and those that are faithless, they will not be true.

At best we must say it is an unproved assumption with as much against as for it.

So we interject some children, a new re-agent in our experiment. Here lies the heavy artillery of the established order. Again I shall assume affluence, if you will, for we must put in one factor at a time. That children may well profit by a home which one spouse had rather leave, is sometimes true, tragically true. That calls for high self-denial and may be the means of grace to a saint. But how often is it true, how often does it mean the perpetuation for children of surroundings which spill their joy and cripple their affections? How many men and women can conceal a chronic irritation, to say nothing of a loathing? How useful to children is such a home? So the liberals have always answered and there we must leave it. It is not a question for social or legal sanction at all; we should always with reverence avoid a judgment, when we are once satisfied that the disappointed spouse has tried to meet that sore trial, with such wisdom as he or she can muster. Neither Mrs. Grundy nor the blind goddess can assume with their crude means to pass on that. Those who are selfish and hard will be selfish and hard whether they be united or alone; we may scourge them for their sins generally, if we will, but we have no right to suppose that in this decision they do unwisely till we know all that of which we can in fact know nothing.

So far we have not found any safe foundation for compulsion, nothing which we can in practice apply. Let us add our last re-agent, poverty, because we have been talking so far of a world where people have the chance to cultivate their souls, to go where their true spiritual needs lead them. That is the world for very few; to most no nice possibility of better adjustments is open. As a man must work though some incipient disease is on him, so he must go on though his spirit is slowly and permanently twisting into deformity. Now we know that to the straitened a household has an economic value; the woman is as necessary a part of the tiny polity as the man. If you break it up and ask the members to continue on the same income, you degrade their common standard, at least if both have been normally industrious and capable. An unhappy union in such circumstances will endure long of itself; it costs too much to live free. Society has a genuine interest to preserve such homes, at least if there are children; it cannot afford to divide the existing scanty fare and imperil doubly an already hazardous experiment.

So that really divorce should be a privilege of the rich, you say, one more liberty that wealth may give and poverty deny. Well, that is the truth of the existing order, whether you like it or not. What I have said might perhaps bring it out a little more

clearly. It would be the privilege of those whose incomes bore a high enough proportion to the number of their children. Those who fell below would go without; they would have no right to the elegancies of conjugal adaptation. Yet we might look at it a little less individualistically; we might treat it as a privilege, it is true, but as a privilege which all should share. A certain number of unhappy unions will occur; some divine actuary could after proper inquiry predict just how many there would be next year. There would be more disclosed, if divorce were free, but no more would exist. Some would be held together because one could not afford to break them; others one is rich enough to break—the pieces could have an independent life. Does it not suggest itself that the burden might be equalized? Might it not cost the rich enough to be divorced to help the poor who cannot now live apart? A tax based upon the incomes of the parties proposing divorce might be arranged which would go a long way towards allowing divorce to many to whom

society is right in denying it now. The same practical limitations upon separation which operate upon the poor, the rich would feel. All my better nature calls for a separation, but my living duty in dollars to my children, to my spouse, forbids.

All thought of fault would have to disappear; we should be obliged to face conjugal unhappiness as a misfortune, not a sin. That men and women should still believe that the mutilation of such a continued union is a goodly sacrifice to God, we must accept; men have always mutilated themselves in honor of their gods. But if the sacred taboos subside, and if we seek for our conduct its justification in our own development for happiness, not in our capacity to inflict pain on ourselves, then is not some such plan possible? Is it not a fair incident to a state which seeks a more equal division of those evils which human beings generate within themselves, as their bodies generate poisons? Is it not a kind of insurance?

ALDEN HARDEN.

CORRESPONDENCE

Michigan Progressives Again

SIR: Mr. Gustavus Pope writes you to explain why, in spite of the action of the Michigan Progressives, he voted to endorse Mr. Hughes. He admits that he wanted to find out what the Progressives wanted; that he called a meeting of the men who composed the delegation to the national convention, the men who composed the state committee and others—that about 60 came to the meeting; that this meeting passed a resolution against endorsing Mr. Hughes; and that he voted for endorsing Mr. Hughes. That is all that I stated in my statement or report.

I understand that the Progressives of Michigan have recalled Mr. Pope and elected a Mr. Hoffman in his place.

MATTHEW HALE.

Boston, Massachusetts.

A Reply from M. von Sternberg

SIR: My attention has just been called to two of your issues which did me the honor of discussing my work in connection with the two volumes of "Modern Russian Piano Music" published by the Oliver Ditson Company.

Ignorantly assailed in the issue of July 8th by a Mr. Moderwell and manfully defended in the next issue by a Mr. A. Walter Kramer, I am sorry, indeed, to be an absolute stranger to both; but to the latter gentleman I feel deeply grateful, not only for his graceful and generous recognition of my modest merits, but also for disproving Mr. Moderwell's unwarranted assertion that I am "neither modern nor Russian."

Mr. Moderwell has fully expressed his personal opinion of my work, for our Constitution allows the expression of opinion even to those who lack the equipment to form one;

and Mr. Moderwell plainly demonstrates that he belongs to this class by his careless statement of facts he cannot substantiate.

As Mr. Kramer correctly said, I was born and raised in St. Petersburg, now Petrograd; my family still lives there. From my correspondence with the late Balakireff and Rimsky-Korsakoff, with Glazounoff, and Caesar Cui, also with Messrs. Maykapar, Kasuli, Karpoff and others of the younger generation (some of whom have honored me with the dedication of compositions) it can be easily seen that at its base are very pleasant personal relations which had their beginning when two of my trios were played in Petrograd by the Chamber-music Society. By flinging out the statement that I am no Russian, Mr. Moderwell has evidently acted upon very loose information and this does not speak well for his reliability as a public informant, nor for his feeling of responsibility to his readers.

Whether I am or am not modern, is not left for him to decide; it has been affirmatively determined by men who enjoy general recognition because of their knowledge and judgment. Besides, upon what does Mr. Moderwell base his opinion of modernity? By what standard does he measure it? And if he should have a standard, by whom and where was it recognized? He evidently ignores the difference between "modernity" and its frenzied caricature "modernism," that conscious and rather vulgar effort at mere "newness." While there are some Russian compositions of this type they are cosmopolitan in spirit, not ethnical. What I endeavored to present to the public was music that expressed the national note and while I did not devote the two volumes entirely to composers of the younger generation, they occupy the bulk of the collection. I felt it to be my duty to give some consideration to the historical aspect of Russian music because the creations of their predecessors have a decided bearing upon the works of its present representatives.

If Mr. Moderwell is to assume the position of a critic of authority he must learn to subordinate his personal predilections to the ethical and critical principles that establish authority.

CONSTANTIN IVANOVITCH VON STERNBERG.
Winthrop, Massachusetts.

What the World Needs

SIR: I have just read the letter entitled "From Doubts to Views" in your issue of July 29th. R. C. B. thanks God that in *THE NEW REPUBLIC* the untrammelled mind may disport itself, and though I may not qualify for your pages I must tell you personally that I am mad. You see, we own a Ford, and we are poor but respectable, and we are Baptists (not Methodists, but still—you know!) and have been Bull Moose, and we have a flag-pole with a flag on it, and my husband was a scout-master, and is at present captain of a company of the New York National Guard which is fighting flies on the border—in other words, a "wife-deserting patriot." But I am not a "weeping woman." I am too proud of my husband, too much in sympathy with his patriotism. We were never so close together in spirit as we are now, when the width of the country our ancestors fought for lies between us.

I believe that a regiment of Methodist and Baptist missionaries could do more in Mexico than a regiment of soldiers. I imagine that R. C. B. and I might agree on many points and I hope we should not hate one another. But I submit that what this country needs, and what the world needs, more than armies, more than advanced thinkers, is folks who don't know how to sneer.

A. B. M.

Auburn, New York.

History of the Suffrage Planks

SIR: It was a great surprise to find an article in *THE NEW REPUBLIC* so full of misstatements as the article on "The Woman's Party," by Charles A. Beard, in your issue of July 29th. The most glaring of these misstatements is that the third and fourth achievements of the Woman's party and the Congressional Union were the planks in the Republican and Democratic platforms.

The facts in the case are these: At both Chicago and St. Louis the representatives of the Woman's party and the Congressional Union announced to the Republican and Democratic Resolutions Committees that they were not asking for planks. They emphasized the fact that they were asking distinctly for the endorsement of the Federal amendment—the one thing which the parties did not give.

Preceding these conventions members and officers of the Congressional Union issued frequent statements to the press and in their own organ, belittling the importance of planks and reiterating that the Congressional Union was not interested in them—that they sought action on behalf of the Federal amendment only. In view of this, I have no doubt that members of the Congressional Union and Woman's party were also amazed at the errors in Mr. Beard's article.

The National American Woman Suffrage Association for six months previous to these two conventions had conducted a campaign all over this country to secure planks in the platforms of the two dominant parties, such planks to embody an endorsement of the principle of woman suffrage. The two demonstrations—the parade in Chicago

and the "walkless parade" in St. Louis—were the work of the National Association.

The inclusion of the planks by the two parties was the direct result of this campaign on the part of the National Association and its branches in the forty-eight states in the Union. The Republican committee took the very wording of the plank submitted to them by the National Association, used it bodily, and then added the clause with reference to state action.

"By the records of the press and eye-witnesses" and in the judgment of the leading men of both parties and thousands of their cohorts, the inclusion of the suffrage planks in the platforms of the two dominant political parties constitute the greatest advance made by the suffrage movement this year.

The National Association first sponsored the Federal amendment and has consistently worked for its passage for many years, hence it is as much interested and perhaps more interested in its success than any other suffrage group or organization could be. Yet the policies and methods of the two organizations at present working for the amendment are so diametrically opposed that it is important that in any statement of suffrage history the true facts shall be given to the public. I feel sure that *THE NEW REPUBLIC* will want to furnish its readers with the actual history of the suffrage planks and the activities which led to their inclusion in the national platforms.

JENNIE BRADLEY ROESSING.

National American Woman Suffrage Association,
Washington, D. C.

Voting Geographically

SIR: Mr. Cleveland's article in a recent issue, "Why We Have a Pork Barrel" certainly brings out clearly the chief cause of the reckless and irresponsible appropriations of public money that flourish in Congress. It does not mention, however, one contributing cause that is of sufficient importance, I think, to be given thoughtful consideration: the fact that the members of the House are elected, for the most part, by single-member districts.

It is easy to see what must be the effect of having each member elected by *all* the voters, however much they may differ on political principles, who happen to live inside of a certain arbitrary line on the map. The candidate that carries the election in such a district is, of course, dependent for reelection on getting more votes than any other candidate from a body of voters who are united on one thing only—an interest in their district. Naturally a member who is at all doubtful about retaining his seat realizes that it behooves him to do something for that district whether the country at large is benefited or not.

To get rid of this contributing cause of the continuance of "pork barrel" methods of appropriation it is necessary only to have the members of the House elected in groups by the method known as proportional representation. For example, the eleven members elected at present by the eleven separate districts of Iowa might be elected at large, under the proportional system—but in such a way that the several political parties would each secure as many of the seats as its votes entitled it to. This change made, each member of the House from Iowa would be dependent for reelection on a constituency of genuine supporters within a territory so extensive that appropriations of benefit only to restricted localities would make no great appeal.

C. G. HOAG.

Tamworth, New Hampshire.

Books and Things

IT is obvious that those men in the British government upon whose decision Sir Roger Casement's fate depended, and who could if they chose have kept him from being hanged, did not enter a region of abstractions before trying to appraise his conduct. They must have done their best to consider all the known circumstances. Instead of stopping their imaginations short at their decision itself they must have sent them further, have encouraged them to run into the living consequences of hanging him or of commuting his sentence. Impossible to read Lord Robert Cecil's defense of the execution without feeling that these men, who refused to let political expediency influence them to clemency, must for days have been thinking of political expediency most of all. They must have acted on the very motive which Lord Robert Cecil said they rejected. It was not their anger or panic or vindictiveness which hanged Sir Roger Casement: it was political expediency, it was what these men deemed the good of the British Empire.

To hang him was both politically expedient and politically inexpedient, in the same sense that commutation of his sentence would have been both. In other words, it was partly a quantitative problem which those officials had to consider in whose hands his fate lay. They had to think of numbers, to estimate by the best light they had how many persons would be outraged if he were hanged, how many more or how many less would be outraged if his life were spared; and they had also to think not of numbers only, for the minority might easily be more powerful than the majority for good or harm to the empire. By their best light they had to consider these things, and their best light was weak and flickering. "There are many subjects," Santayana has said, "of which man is so ignorant that only mythical notions can seem to do them justice; such, for instance, are the minds of other men." Sir Roger Casement's fate was a political subject, and everybody who deals practically with a political subject is dealing with the minds of other men.

At one extreme were the minds of the men who say without qualification, and who think they believe without qualification, that every traitor ought to be hanged. Now it is true that since Sir Roger Casement was captured on the Irish Coast, and since the evidence against him was presented at his trial, no one has defined a traitor in words which would leave him out. Although he conceived Ireland as a separate country, his own, and as having a right to his exclusive allegiance, and although he conceived the giving of aid and comfort to Germany as a means, yet his plans if successful would have had the same result as though bettering Ireland had been only the means and helping Germany the single end he strove for.

No, it cannot be denied that Sir Roger Casement was a traitor. And yet, guessing as best we may at the minds of those in whose approval of his execution there is no conscious regret, we cannot help imagining that their approval would have been more wholesouled, more nearly absolute, if he had been a traitor without being also an Irish patriot, however wrongheaded, or if he had sold himself to Germany for the satisfaction of a personal spite or for money. If we imagine this, and take what we have imagined for truth, we see how even those who most unreservedly applaud Sir Roger Casement's execution are close to those who cannot wholly approve it.

Strange to think that the good of the British Empire, that political expediency, if measured by the numbers and the power of those who are outraged by his hanging, and

by the numbers and power of those who would have been outraged had he not been hanged, may conceivably have been affected little or not at all by his fate. Strange to think of this possibility, and infinitely disturbing even to one who had no hand in the decision.

At the other extreme from the men who are content to say that treason in every form should always be punished by death, but like them in judging the world by stripping every action to its bones, by ignoring the flesh and blood and color, are the men who oppose capital punishment everywhere and always. These men are often described as sentimentalists, they are accused of exaggerating the worth of human life, of exaggerating the importance of hastening that end which after all every life must have, of being men of weak nerves who sicken at the name of death. Of some among them this account is accurate; not of all. Some opponents of capital punishment can endure the idea of death by almost any other means. When angry enough or quickened by a high cause they can kill or be killed. Death in most of its forms has still the power to weaken in some of us a little of the old consoling faith taught us as children; some of us can still imagine death as saying, "Be not afraid; it is I," to the man who is **not afraid**. But when we think of capital punishment no old refuge is open to the imagination. Our attention is not upon the man who dies but upon the men who might have saved his life.

Perhaps we can make our feeling plain by magnifying its courses. Suppose the interval between Sir Roger Casement's sentence and his execution had been longer, perhaps a year, and suppose the officials who had the power of life and death over him had decided his case anew every day. There would be something monstrous, to nearly every imagination, in the thought of these men, for hour after hour of so many days, through a period long enough to cool passion and to deaden hatred, still keeping fast their determination to kill another man calmly, by due process of law, at the appointed time. "Now I might save him—and now—and now—and I will not." There would be something hateful to most of us in a cold righteousness so prolonged, and what most of us would feel in such a case many of us feel now.

I do not mean that all or most of the men who let Sir Roger Casement hang were coldly righteous. They were men whose imaginations no doubt differed widely. To some of them his death was such a natural, simple consequence of his treason that the choice before them was never real: they had no compunction. Others there must have been who sickened and could not sleep, who thought of the fine traits in Sir Roger Casement's character, of his proved capacity for pity and courage, whose own misery made them dwell on that element of cold waste from which their determination to hang him did not seem to them quite free.

These men had the power of life and death: in full consciousness of their responsibility they made the choice which they thought politically more expedient or less inexpedient. If one of them now finds peace of mind in telling himself that his sole object was to do some abstract thing he calls right, that he did not consider political expediency, that he only let the law take its course, I shall not grudge him his self-deception. What he did, if we consider only its nearer consequences, may have been the wiser thing. It is possible to believe this and still to believe that these British statesmen have sacrificed the future of their country to the present, that a later generation may see in Sir Roger Casement's execution proof of England's excessive fear that magnanimity is weakness.

P. L.

The New International

The New International Encyclopaedia, edited by Frank Moore Colby and Talcott Williams. Second Edition. Vols. I-XX. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company. Cloth. \$5.00 a volume.

IN the preface to the first edition of the New International Encyclopaedia the editors were carefully emphatic of the fact that the work was a new one—"not a new edition or revision of the International Cyclopaedia, . . . not based upon that or upon any other publication." Within not too immodest limits, this statement is true. Here and there were blocks of reprint from the older work, and in the office Brockhaus's "Conversations-Lexikon," which the editors had adopted as their conscious model, became a sort of vade mecum for the staff; but all in all the "New International" was honestly as new as a work of reference is likely to be.

For it should be understood, by editors and public alike, that unqualified newness is no unprejudiced virtue in reference books. Of the four qualities of the ideal encyclopaedia—accuracy, comprehensiveness, attractiveness, and convenience—which the "New International" editors laid down in the mentioned preface, accuracy they rightly made first; and accuracy, as all know who have worked minutely, is best assured by the test of time. In youth is rashness, and reference works are great spreaders of contagious error. The work with a long history, many editions, and much trying-out, is most likely to be clean with the truth—granted, of course, that it represents the conscientious offering of an alert and conscientious house.

The second edition of the "New International" gains confidence, therefore, from the mere fact that it is a second edition. This confidence is augmented by the further fact that the new edition represents a resetting and enlarging of the first: two volumes added and page-size increased. The world moves rapidly in a rapid age, and reference materials are cumulative. Again, revision accompanies enlargement; and with all its recognized merits, there was much in the first "New International" that called for the hand of correction. Finally, the editors of the revision—Frank Moore Colby and Talcott Williams—are men of specialized experience in the reference book field, whose names on the title-page are of far more significance than would be that, say, of an eminent educator paid by the publisher to lend the work his affable approval. On the face of things, the new edition is as much better than the old as it should be. Nor is this superficial promise betrayed by closer inspection. The first "New International" contained many articles that missed the encyclopaedic character. They were of good material, frequently the work of eminent specialists, but not marked by that prime desideratum of the practical reference-book article—the subject-matter in bold relief. Those who have made the first edition familiar through use will be repeatedly gratified, in substituting the revised edition, to find that blurred and ponderous treatments have been cleared and lightened by skilled editing and perspicuous addition. It is only necessary to note in the new edition the number of articles of composite authorship (representing old materials revised and amended) to realize how extensive has been this work of clarification, and a brief comparison with the older articles will show uniform improvement. This, of course, is what is to be expected in a revised work, but it is by no means what is always to be found; many a publisher has discovered that it is easier to change than to improve, and it is altogether to the credit of the present pub-

lishers that they have made the work of revision truly such by keeping it in capable hands.

Not that the new edition shows no defects. One is not reassured by the frontispiece of Volume I—a map of the world which the merest glance will show to be a meagrely altered version of a precursor drawn (at a fair guess) in the decade preceding 1860. Most of the many maps in the encyclopaedia seem to be of the same character, old drawings feebly revamped. This is a great pity, for there is no single need in the field of books of reference quite so unmitigated as that for good maps, Anglo-American. To be sure, maps are expensive printing, but some publisher will yet learn that he can profitably devote all the money that now goes into gaudy polychromes to maps alone and make his work thrice indispensable. The "New International" is clearly cautious in this respect, finding it easier, for example, to give in two places—under "Korea" and "Manchuria"—the same map of the two countries combined, rather than furnish one good map of either.

As a whole, the illustrations in the "New International" are attractive. They will help sell the book. But the usefulness of many of them—in this age of prolific picturing—is not so manifest. In Volume I, under "Automobile," there are fine half-tones of a Packard and a Ford (why, pray, should the bourgeoisie of motordom be so slighted?) in models which to the eyes of the sophisticated motorist already appear antiquated; and the volume is dated 1914. One quite expects to find under "Motor Vehicles," where the automobile is really described, models of 1916 portrayed; but the editors have sensibly utilized their space with the mechanical diagrams which form the really valuable illustrations in an article of this character. Again, under "Decorative Art"—a brief and inadequate article, by the way—there is a gorgeous polychrome of a Pompeian mural piece—and that is all! Even where the pictures are better chosen, they are not always well utilized. A full-page halftone of the Laocoön group illustrates the article "Laocoön." Now the chief current value of this picture is surely to give students of Lessing a clear conception of what he is talking about in his theory of art. And yet in the article "Laocoön" there is no mention of Lessing, while the brief paragraph "Laocoön" gives neither reference to the picture nor an explanation of Lessing's theory—which is mentioned, but not explained, under "Lessing," to which one is referred.

This brings us to the special claims which the editors make for the second edition in their brief preface: "the placing of the titles under subjects to which the reader would naturally turn first, the use of a single alphabet with so copious a supply of cross-references as to dispense with the necessity of an index, a very inclusive title list, a full and practical bibliography for all important subjects"—such are the foremost of these claims. Do they test out?

Would one, for example, turn to "automobile" or "motor vehicle" first? The explanation which the writer of the first-named article felt bound to make—that the English have never really looked with favor upon "automobile," preferring "motorcar"—is a ludicrous cover for what was probably the real reason for putting the treatment under "motor vehicle"—viz., that the latter comes well along in the alphabet, and the automobile is a rapidly developing machine. Time is thus gained for more of that up-to-dateness which is the trump of all reference-book salesmen.

Possibly up-to-date buyers would look in an encyclopaedia for such titles as "pageants" (liberally treated) and "efficiency" (though we miss "efficiency expert"!); but

there is an array of titles of principal articles to which only an imaginative or perverse seeker after knowledge would dream of turning. "Knowledge" itself is the occasion for a metaphysical disquisition which would, in all nature, be sought either under "epistemology" or "theory of knowledge"; and who would turn to such titles as "mortuary customs," "mensurable music," "grinding, crushing and pulverizing machinery," "fraternal insurance," "intensity of sensation," rather than to burial, music, machine, insurance, sensation? These are chance examples, out of many.

Of course your editor replies that his cross-reference system saves the day—that articles of this type are really put in to satisfy cross-reference needs. This is only awkwardly true. For the cross-reference system itself is badly managed. Such peccadilloes as "Choson" referring to "Korea, or Chosen," as references now to "program," now "programme" music,—as "Index" when "Index cephalic," is meant—may be passed. But to stick to our examples, why should "insurance" cross-refer to "accident," "fire," "life," "marine," and not to "fraternal"? What help is it to the man who wishes information regarding grinding machinery, laundry machinery, or the economic effects of machinery, to find the heading "Machine" followed by references only to "Mechanical powers—machines, Metal-working Machinery, Woodworking Machinery, etc."? The *etc.* is an eloquent confession of failure.

Music, again, is treated in a series of articles, "Music" (mainly aesthetics), "Music, history of," "Music, psychology of," "Musical instruments," "Musical notation," with cross-references to a multitude of special topics, from "Lied" to "Debussy," but where is the references to "Instrumental Music"? and who would "naturally" look under "Instrumental" rather than "Music"? and why should not the topic be better treated in one systematic article, properly subdivided? The systematic article would certainly save space.

Our editor will doubtless retort that if we hunt persistently we must eventually take our quarry. This may be true, but there are apparent lapses. One, in regard to Lessing's "Laokoön," has already been noted. Suppose we turn to "Poetics" for Aristotle's theory of the drama. Here a brief paragraph informs us that Aristotle's book is at the fountainhead of dramatic criticism, and refers us to "Aristotle." But the writer of this latter article has only a brief paragraph on the "Poetics," in no sense adequate or informing. At a guess we turn to "Drama," but not even here is there any discussion of the central theories of all dramatic criticism. Where is this discussion? Perhaps it is buried somewhere in the twenty-two volumes, produced or to be, of the encyclopaedia, but if it be therein (and surely no great encyclopaedia is complete without it), there is given no intelligible clue to its discovery.

The fact is the cross-reference system does not, and cannot be expected to, do away with the need of an index. Probably the most valuable single reference book in the world is the index volume to the "Encyclopaedia Britannica," and if the editors of the "New International" are wise in their day, they will complete their work with such a volume.

The editorial claim of "a full and practical bibliography for all important subjects" comes off little better than their substitute for an index. Taken as a whole the bibliographies of the "New International" compare favorably with those of other encyclopaedias. One may even say that they constitute the best reference work for classified book titles readily available in English, owing to the number of titles and the consistent effort to give bibliography

even to brief articles. But all this notwithstanding, the bibliographical feature is far from ideal. Encyclopaedias are not called upon to give the full literature of a subject; but they should give information as to the best introductions and bibliographical guides to the fields and topics treated. Mere strings of titles, even of worthy books, are of not much worth unless the nature of the books named be characterized; and the "New International" does practically nothing in this direction. Under "Poetics," above mentioned, a great number of titles could have been entered, for Aristotle's commentators are legion. That would, of course, have been out of place. But it would have been decidedly in place to mention, along with S. H. Butcher's translation and commentary, the later edition by Ingram Bywater, the notes to which make it in effect a guide to the whole literature. And if we turn to the bibliography under "Aristotle" we are surprised to find no mention of the great Oxford translation of the works of Aristotle, of which the "Metaphysica" appeared as early as 1908, and no mention of the Didot edition, in some respects superior to the Bekker; while there would have been at least a dramatic propriety in mentioning the Thomistic edition projected and begun by the scholars of Louvain, but interrupted by the war. There are equally slovenly omissions in the bibliography under "Plato": Archer-Hind's bizarre editions of the "Phaedo" and "Timaeus" are named, but not Martin's well-known "Études sur la Timée" nor Burnet's fine edition of the "Phaedo." Indeed, Burnet's name is not in the article, nor Natorp's, nor Hunt's; and there is no article "Platonism" to supplement the many defects of the discussion, both of Plato's philosophy and of its influence on European thought.

These are only examples of deficiencies in rather full bibliographies. In many cases not even the merit of number of titles is to be found. As good an example as any is found under "Indians, American" (there is, by the way, no cross-reference from "American Indian" inserted for the benefit of your squeamish Englishman). Not even the publications of the Bureau of Ethnology and the great museums with Americanist series are cited, nor the proceedings of the International Society of Americanists, nor Canadian, British, nor Latin-American serial works and collections. And one might surely expect in an article published in 1914 a bibliographical reference to so fine a guide to American archaeology as Beuchat's "Manuel d'archéologie américaine" (Paris, 1912); but the title is entered under neither "Archaeology, American," nor the 1915 "Indians, American," although far less important titles are included.

Good bibliographies, like good maps, are an expensive rather than a showy feature; but, as in the case of maps, publishers will yet learn that they are in the long run a paying feature. In the preface to their first edition, the editors of the "New International" distinguished from the encyclopaedic type of the "Britannica," "a collection of elaborate monographs," the Brockhaus type, approaching the encyclopaedic dictionary; and they chose the latter for their model. In the intervening period, the "Britannica" has brought out an edition which goes very far (possibly a covert compliment to the "New International") in the direction of the lexicon. The editors of the second edition of the "New International" would certainly have gained had they reciprocally moved toward the "Britannica model," to the extent at least of concentrating some of their diffuse materials. But they would have gained still more had they clearly foreseen what must be the ency-

clopaedic types of the future, and chosen one of these for their own.

Undoubtedly the monographic survey of all science, of which the 18th century French "Encyclopédie" and the old "Britannica" are the outstanding models, will disappear before the growing mass of knowledge: nowadays not an encyclopaedic monograph but a monographic encyclopaedia is required to take care of a department of knowledge. But in place of the monographic survey, there is coming to be more and more a demand for a bibliographic survey of knowledge in its several fields. If the reviewer may be allowed to predict (and what reviewer abstains from prophecy?) the two great types of the future encyclopaedias, general in scope, will be the bibliographical and the school or text-book type. The latter will be devoted to brief and elementary summaries, following the text-book model; and like text-books they will be rewritten and reset at least by decades. The former will be cumulative works: the slow assembling and refining of the contents of that ever-increasing expression of fact and fancy which we call the course of civilization. Work of this type does not become out-of-date in a decade; it outlives paper and it outlives printing plates. It needs constant supplementation, but not decennial replacement; and it is unthinkable that keen-eyed publishers will not sooner or later perceive that it is poor economy to try to reach these disparate markets with one ware.

H. B. A.

An Excellent Hate Story

The Prisoner, by Alice Brown. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

HATE being an emotion almost as common as love and not a bit less exciting, it seems strange that love-stories are so much more frequent than hate-stories. A hate-story, as we understand it, is not merely a study of a hateful character, but the expression of the author's own hatred for the child of his imagination. George Eliot, for instance, hated Rosamond, but with such iron self-control that "Middlemarch" cannot be rated as a frank hate-story. Thackeray did not hate Becky at all. Whereas Mr. Grant's personal attitude toward Selma made "Unleavened Bread" a capital example of this form of art.

"The Prisoner" comes near to being a pure hate-story. Esther, though not intended to be the most important character, dominates the book on account of the emotion that surrounds her, and that emotion is the author's hatred. Miss Brown, like the excellent sorceress she is, has made a wax image of all the feminine traits she most dislikes, and the process by which she sticks pins in this image and finally dissolves it, is as pleasant to her as it is to the reader. For the reader, of course, hates Esther too, and her collapse, far more than the union of the lovers, is what makes for a happy ending.

We are so much pleased at Esther's destruction that it is ungracious to criticize its method. But it must be noticed that in American novels the downfall of a cowardly and deceitful married woman is her running away to Europe with a man to whom she is not married. At first sight such an action, however unworthy, seems to call for a certain amount of frankness and courage. But second thoughts reveal to us that it is merely a symbol in the author's mind for vice discovered, and as such ought to be accepted by every moralist as satisfactory.

In sharp contrast to Esther is Miss Brown's treatment

of Madame Beattie—a naughty old party, who goes sponging, rioting and blackmailing through the book, and gets off scot-free in the end. Perhaps no punishment is available, since we are led to suppose that to go to Europe with someone else's husband would not be looked upon by Madame Beattie as either cruel or unusual.

As a whole the book is noticeable for the closeness of its weave, the thickness of its pattern. Of all the effects of real life, this is perhaps the most difficult for the novelist to simulate. In our daily experience something is always happening, even if it is nothing more positive than that we are being incalculably bored or rendered fairly content. The story-teller is too apt to leave these stretches blank. Miss Brown is very successful in giving to her book the impression of continuity; and she does it by quietly heightening the interest of everyday happenings.

She selects, in the first place, an interesting situation—that of a gentleman of fine and sensitive nature who returns after a prison sentence to take up his normal life. She then throws, on each aspect of the New England town in which he finds himself, the high light of a little crime or love or adventure. She does it, however, in so gentle a manner that the reader hardly notices that the incidents are anything but the commonplaces of daily experience.

Before I had read the book, it suffered in my estimation from some of the most flattering reviews of it. These intimated that it was a profound study of the immigrant question and prison reform. Happily it is neither. Miss Brown uses both ideas as elements in the situation to which her characters react, without, God bless her, a single theoretical ax to grind. The book is a new proof that no just-minded person should be turned from a favorite author by laudatory reviews—not even by this one.

ALICE DUER MILLER.

The Machinery of the State

The Principles of Constitutional Government, by Frank J. Goodnow. New York: Harper Brothers. \$2 net.

PRESIDENT GOODNOW has written a useful and, on the whole, stimulating volume. He has discussed on the basis of some dozen fundamental principles the general political significance of constitutional government. He has set in an interesting perspective the differences of approach which characterize the English, American and European traditions. He never allows himself to be led away by that plethora of facts which too often tempts the writer of a text-book into dullness. His style, if it is too rarely dignified, is always simple and clear. If his book lacks something of the refreshing novelty of outlook which has given his earlier work so important a place in the history of American political theory, the fact that it was written for delivery as lectures to the University of Pekin is perhaps an adequate explanation. Its main defect is a certain absence of arresting personality, a determination to be pedagogic where there is the opportunity to be vivid. It can never be too greatly emphasized that there are intermediate shades between black and purple.

What is at the outset important in Dr. Goodnow's volume is his definite perception of the need for political variety. We have to take account of conditions. It is simply useless to attempt a wholesale transference of constitutions. They are not made but evolved. Even the American Constitution is not a written document, but the host of ideas and dreams which the thought of a century and a half of

experience almost passionate in quality has deposited in the minds of men. The needs of America are not the needs of England; and it is refreshing to see how clearly Dr. Goodnow has emphasized the folly of making absolute judgments on the method of response to constitutional problems. That emphasis is the more important in an age which has turned its attention to centralizing systems. He brings out clearly, too, the changing attitude to the written constitution. With the exception of England, and, in some sort, France, it is the general experience of Europe that the unwritten word has had its day. Granted facility of amendment it seems better to have the definite crystallization of forms and principles than their hazy confinement to half-understood and partly antique fictions and conventions. This development is the more significant when it is remembered that the Parliament act of 1911 goes far to give Great Britain a written constitution. It became clear that the old satisfaction with uncertainties made heroic by the lapse of time was no longer justifiable. The constitutions of the British colonies are in reality the expression of a similar attitude. They are the proof of responsibility, and the evidence that with manhood freedom demands the written charter of her rights.

Such a development is set in striking contrast to the American and, indeed, continental belief in the validity of a system of natural rights external to the frame of governance. It is important that we should realize how greatly our individualism is the result of an ancient political creed for which there is little or no justification at the present time. The conception of society for which the American courts have stood is, as a consequence, a purely static one. It limits the possibilities of political development to the boundaries of certain *a priori* dogmas which, as Dr. Goodnow points out, may well be a positive hindrance to improvement. Only the inelegant fiction of the police power has prevented the ineptitudes of the Fourteenth amendment from restraining the American commonwealth in the swaddling-clothes of mid-Victorian utilitarianism. It is not until we see, as the political and unphilosophic mind of the Englishman has plainly understood, that every system of rights must be defined in items of social necessity, that we obtain a conception of society at all adequate to our situation. A rigid constitution was indeed the natural child of its inflexible Jeffersonian foster-parent. The latter was saturated with the easy and false logic which saw civilization as a beatific state of nature in which governments did no more than help men to plant their potatoes. Such a philosophy carries within itself the germ of internal decay. We cannot read our life in any terms save those which project the center of political importance far into the future. The protection of individual liberty against the state may be an admirable thing so long as we give the right content to those terms. The difficulty here, as in so much of our political thinking, is that we allow the abstractness of their character to obscure the living men and women they were intended to reveal. Professor Pound, in a famous paper, has indicated the right approach to these problems. It is exhilarating to see a text-book intended for university students which does not linger in these demolished mansions.

It is difficult to follow Dr. Goodnow in his belief that cabinet government is barely reconcilable with presidential government. Unquestionably, one of the main factors in the success of the British system has been the continuous existence of either two or three great parties which followed each other in the control of, or search for, power. But it is not in the least clear that the unfortunate experi-

TIFFANY & Co.

SILVER, SUBSTANTIAL IN WEIGHT

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

ence of France or Italy is likely to be repeated in the United States. Even if—as seems not impossible—the next few years see a complete readjustment of the American parties, it yet remains clear that in the vast problem of industrial organization there is a real pivot round which an adequate alignment of parties may be made to hinge. It is not an unpalatable hypothesis that the separation of executive and legislature has had its day; and certainly no better method of their connection has been evolved than the cabinet system presents. And it may be reasonably suggested that the instability of French and Italian government is not only less than actually appears but is also, when stated numerically in terms of the tenure of office, likely to exaggerate the contrast with America. For it must be remembered that continuity and administrative efficiency are still the basic governmental problems in this country; and it may be doubted whether men like Waldeck-Rousseau and Briand cannot lay claim to as coherent a scheme of legislation as any to which an American statesman can pretend. No one now believes in its entirety the classic criticism of Bagehot upon the presidential system; but that does not offer good reason for this equal stride in the opposite direction.

The one substantial defect in Dr. Goodnow's book is the absence of any discussion of the future of the parliamentary system. I know of no more fundamental question. Anyone who studies the history of the budget of 1909, or of the Home Rule acts of the past five years, will find it difficult to avoid the opinion that a deliberative assembly is incapable of dealing with the details of legislation. American experience of Congress points to a similar conclusion. Men in the mass seem mentally capable of no

more than a fairly steady hold of principles. The development of commissions like those which deal with commerce in America and development in England suggest that in the future the functions of Parliament will be largely confined to the discussion of fundamental dogma and the criticism of administration. As with the execution of justice, it is the few men round the table to whom the detailed vision is revealed. What effect that change is likely to have on the character of our institutions raises speculations of the profoundest significance.

When Dr. Goodnow revises this book for that second edition which its quality deserves, there is one important consideration I would venture to urge he should bear in mind. It is clear that men are interested not in measures but in leaders. They gain their ideas through men. Twice as many electors will cast a ballot for governor as will vote on an important referendum. And with the general reader for whom this book is intended the same truth holds. I should like greatly to see what effect the volume would have when recast in terms not of political ideas but of political personalities. Where it talks of the Presidency I should like to see it talk of Lincoln and McKinley, of Roosevelt and Taft; where it talks of the cabinet I should like to see it discuss Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone, Disraeli and Mr. Lloyd-George. A book so planned and executed could be one of the great educative forces of our time.

H. J. L.

Unindustrial Education

Wage Worth of School Training, by Anna C. Hedges.
New York: Columbia University-Teachers' College.

A BOOK which aims to discourage the specific vocational education of girls and women offers very untimely counsel at this particular season. Events were never less auspicious for decrying the value of technical training for women wage-earners. At this moment vast numbers of women are plying the most highly skilled trades of the most highly skilled nations of Europe. In both England and Germany the movement for vocational training for girls has gained new momentum during the past twelve months. In this country, many states are laying the foundations for a system of industrial education in connection with the public schools. It is short-sighted from every point of view to set forth any program which would exclude girls from the influences which make for skill and technique.

The principal recommendation of Miss Hedges's study is a negative one. She sets out with the purpose of learning what factory requirements should influence the education of girls for industrial life. Her main conclusion is that school training for specific operations is not necessary. The girl wage-earner needs only to receive "instruction in English, in hygiene, and in dexterity." The result of the author's inquiry—and here we must credit her with candor if not with foresight—was to change her "prior position as an advocate of trade training for girls whose schooling must be limited to the grammar school to the viewpoint of more and better general education for all grammar school girls irrespective of their career beyond the elementary school."

The author bases her recantation on the study of 515 women workers employed in the manufacture of silk gloves and ribbons, undermuslins, and embroidery. Their average age was 21 years; they had an average experience of 3¾ years; and they earned an average wage of \$7.50. Nearly all of them had left school at fourteen; the seventh grade

was their maximum in education; and they had first begun to work at an average wage of \$4.00. As Miss Hedges says, "This is unprogressive wage-earning, to say the least."

She sees no hope for this situation in the development of industry. She accepts as ultimate and unchangeable the progressive subdivision of labor, the infinite multiplication of unskilled processes, and the complete segregation of women in the crude, repetitive branches. With a certain enthusiasm of hopefulness, she proposes that, as human work can never again be humanized, the patient should at least be made as comfortable as possible. "If she has interests of an intellectual or artistic nature, she will fill her outside time to her own advancement. This will react on her attitude of mind while at work during the day, make it possible for her to do the repetitive work at the machine sustained by the feeling that, when the day is over and the product of her labor piled up in the basket beside her or credited in her account book, she can get the variety which her tastes and ideas in life demand." In other words, the author sees no possible integration between school and vocation.

Yet Miss Hedges holds strongly to the idea of continuation classes, to be conducted by the school in the factory. These factory schools, for which she suggests the employer should release the worker without deducting from her pay, should confine their attention to more and better general education and avoid all technical training. One might suppose that the employer who paid his employees to go to school for so many hours a week would expect some specific return in the form of efficiency or skill. But he must content himself with Miss Hedges's assurance that instruction in hygiene and English will make for law and order. "Trouble-makers and complainers are apt to be such because of poor health, either physically or mentally." And as for the foreign workers, "though producing more than their neighbors at the machines, they breed discontent and in time of stress, are the first to walk out and to use brute-force measures to make their non-striking sisters uncomfortable; their productiveness of good is not productiveness of good feeling."

Then where, after all, is the industrial worker to receive her vocational training? Miss Hedges disposes of this question by saying that training for specific process operations can be given best and most effectively by the management itself within the factory. How the factory manager is giving this training at present, is described very fully by the study. Sometimes the new girl is placed at the first machine that happens to be empty. Sometimes she gets a little help from the forewoman. But most commonly she gets it from her next-door neighbor, who teaches the newcomer at the expense of her own pay envelope since her work is usually paid for on a piece-rate basis. "This work arrangement which has simplified the work of teaching to the maximum is economical and profitable to the employing firm," says the author. How true!

The book is for the most part made up of intricate and ingrowing statistics which lead nowhere. A more unhelpful contribution to the problem of the vocational education of girls has seldom been made. Besides, it may be actively harmful to an extent not even desired by the author in that it encourages those who, all along the line, are ever ready to hamper the vocational effectiveness of women. The fact that the book was written by the state agent for the vocational education of girls helps to lend importance to its contents. One might reasonably expect from these sources a more discriminating view of the industrial relations and the educational needs of the girl wage-earner.

KATHARINE ANTHONY.